arXiv:1602.01717v2 [math.AP] 9 Mar 2016

THE STRUCTURE OF FLUCTUATIONS IN STOCHASTIC HOMOGENIZATION

MITIA DUERINCKX, ANTOINE GLORIA, AND FELIX OTTO

We establish a path-wise theory of fluctuations in stochastic homogenization of linear elliptic equations in divergence form. More precisely we consider the model problem of a discrete equation with independent and identically distributed conductances. We identify a single quantity, which we call the homogenization commutator, that drives the fluctuations in stochastic homogenization in the following sense. On the one hand, this tensor-valued stationary random field satisfies a functional central limit theorem, and (when suitably rescaled) converges to a Gaussian white noise. On the other hand, the fluctuations of the gradient of the corrector, the fluctuations of the flux of the corrector, and the fluctuations of any solution of the PDE with random coefficients and localized right-hand side are characterized at leading order by the fluctuations of this homogenization commutator in a path-wise sense. As a consequence, when properly rescaled, the solution satisfies a functional central limit theorem, the gradient of the corrector converges to the Helmholtz projection of a Gaussian white noise, and the flux of the corrector converges to the Leray projection of the same white noise. Compared to previous contributions, our approach, based on the homogenization commutator, unravels the complete structure of fluctuations. It holds in any dimension $d \geq 2$, yields the first path-wise results, quantifies the limit theorems in Wasserstein distance, and only relies on arguments that extend to the continuum setting and to the case of systems.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Main result and structure of the proof 4
2.1. Main result 4
2.2. Structure of the proof and auxiliary results 12
3. Limiting covariance structure of the homogenization commutator 16
3.1. Auxiliary lemmas and proof of Proposition 1 16
3.2. Proof of Lemma 2.1 21
3.3. Proof of Lemma 3.3 22
3.4. Proof of Lemma 3.4 24
3.5. Proof of Lemma 3.6 28
3.6. Proof of Lemma 3.7 40
4. Normal approximation for the homogenization commutator 44
4.1. Chatterjee's version of Stein's method 44
4.2. Proof of Proposition 2 46
4.3. Proof of Corollary 1 50
5. Decomposition of the fluctuations of the solution 50
5.1. Auxiliary lemmas and proof of Proposition 3 51
5.2. Proof of Lemma 5.1 53

5.3. Proof of Lemma 5.2 58
5.4. Proof of Lemma 5.3 60
Appendix A. Large-scale maximal regularity 66
Appendix B. Approximation argument 73
Acknowledgements 74
References 74

1. Introduction

In the early period of stochastic homogenization of elliptic equations in divergence form, in the seventies, it was not clear if the ergodicity of the coefficients was sufficient to prove convergence and identify the limit. This is because the correctors, the main analytical tool in homogenization, are not very well-behaved a priori. It was a surprise, therefore, that this was possible in stochastic homogenization, namely, that homogenization was a new type of ergodic theory where the function to be averaged is not quite known but it does have enough special properties (it is a derivative for example) to make the result come out, cf. the seminal works by Papanicolaou & Varadhan [37] and by Kozlov [29]. It is then natural to investigate whether there is an associated quantitative ergodic theory, namely central limit-type theorems (CLT) for quantities like the flux of the corrector, the gradient of the corrector, or the solution of the PDE with random coefficients and localized right-hand side. It is clear that much more is needed than ergodicity for such quantitative ergodic statements to hold. The main difficulty in establishing such statements is that solutions of elliptic equations are nonlinear nonlocal functions of the coefficients. In particular, it is unclear a priori how quantitative ergodic properties of the coefficient field can be transmitted to the solution.

The second and third authors made a first step in that direction in [21, 22], where, inspired by the unpublished work of Naddaf and Spencer [35], they proved that mixing conditions in the form of a spectral gap estimate could be transferred to some extent to the correctors using elliptic regularity theory. In particular, for discrete elliptic equations with independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) coefficients, they proved new moment bounds on the gradient of the corrector, the existence of stationary correctors in dimensions $d > 2$, and, more importantly in view of a CLT, they proved that the variance of spatial averages of the energy density of the corrector converge to zero at the rate of the CLT.

Combining these new bounds on the corrector with the variant of Stein's method developed by Chatterjee [7], Nolen [36] was able to prove that the rescaled fluctuations of the averaged energy density of the corrector are indeed asymptotically normal (and provided an error estimate in Wasserstein distance), a similar result was independently obtained by Rossignol [38] using noise stability (albeit without error estimate). Classically, the proof of the CLT splits into two parts: the asymptotic normality of the fluctuations (as in [36]) and the convergence of the rescaled variance towards some limiting variance, the square-root of which is the limiting standard deviation. The latter part requires to go beyond the scaling of the variance by identifying the limiting "prefactor", which is a finer quantity.

As for the solution of the PDE with random coefficients itself (that is, a random field that we may test in space against compactly supported functions, hence a random distribution), Conlon and Naddaf proved in [9] a nearly-CLT scaling. The CLT scaling was proved in

high dimensions (or small ellipticity ratio) by the second author [12], and in full generality by Marahrens and the third author [31], see also [14].

In terms of the asymptotic behavior of the variance, three results went beyond the CLT scaling by identifying a suitable limiting standard deviation. The first identification of a limiting standard deviation (and proof of a CLT) was achieved by Biskup, Salvi and Wolff [6] for the spatial average of the energy density of the approximation of the corrector with Dirichlet boundary conditions, albeit in the *perturbative* regime of small ellipticity contrast, the proof is based on a (qualitative) compactness argument. To go beyond the perturbative regime, a finer understanding of the correctors is needed. The second work, by Mourrat and the third author [33], identifies the covariance structure of the corrector in dimensions $d > 2$ (directly related to the limiting standard deviation). It is based on [31] and on the quantitative two-scale expansion [17] by the two last authors and Neukamm, and makes crucial use of the Helffer-Sjöstrand representation formula (that holds e.g. for coefficients that are Lipschitz functions of a Gaussian field, cf. [25]). This result was later on extended to the solution of the PDE with random coefficients by Gu and Mourrat [24] in dimensions $d > 2$. The third work, by Nolen and the second author [19], proves the existence of a limiting standard deviation for spatial averages of the energy density of the (periodized) corrector using a (quantitative) compactness argument for all $d \geq 2$. It is based on [31], and on the bounds [18] obtained by the last two authors and Neukamm (it does not rely on the Helffer-Sjöstrand representation formula).

Once the limiting standard deviation is identified, it is by now standard to prove the CLT, using the argument of [36] based on Chatterjee's method of normal approximation. This was achieved in [19] for the averaged energy density of the corrector, and in [32, 24] for the corrector and for the solution of the PDE with random coefficients. The proof of the CLT in [6] is based on a different argument à la Lindenberg-Feller and only proves qualitative convergence in law.

The most important question left open in these works is whether there is some common structure of fluctuations in stochastic homogenization. In the present contribution we unravel such a structure and develop a complete theory of fluctuations in the case of i.i.d. conductances. In particular, we identify a crucial quantity, which we call the homogenization commutator, that (when suitably rescaled) converges as a random distribution towards a Gaussian white noise. We then prove that the fluctuations of the gradient of the corrector, of the flux of the corrector, and of the solution of the PDE with random coefficients can be written at leading order (in L^2 in probability) in terms of the fluctuations of this homogenization commutator (the associated error is even one full order smaller in terms of the scale separation between characteristic length scale of solution and correlation length, up to a logarithmic correction in dimension $d = 2$, cf. (2.22)). We say that this result is "path-wise" in analogy to the usage of this term in stochastic PDE: we do not just relate the probability distribution of the random fields, but we relate the random fields for a given realization of the (noisy) coefficient field. As observed by Gu and Mourrat [24], the fluctuations of any solution cannot be just inferred from those of the corrector via the two-scale expansion, so that in this respect the path-wise relation is quite surprising. As a direct corollary, this path-wise connection implies CLTs for all these quantities, and in particular all relevant fluctuations are to leading order described in terms of the limiting covariance of the homogenization commutator, that is a $(d \times d) \times (d \times d)$-tensor.

The main merit of this work is the identification of this path-wise structure of fluctuations in stochastic homogenization, under strong yet representative assumptions. Besides its theoretical importance, this result is bound to affect multi-scale computing and uncertainty quantification in an essential way since it reduces the fluctuations of the solution operator to those of the sole homogenization commutator in a path-wise sense (cf. Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 below).

Let us conclude by mentioning that the arguments of this paper are robust enough to treat the case of non-symmetric systems, as well as the continuum setting if we assume mixing conditions in the form of functional inequalities (spectral gap, logarithmic-Sobolev inequalities). In view of [10], the class of coefficients to which our techniques of proof apply includes all the practical examples considered in the applied sciences (see e.g. [40]). Indeed, most of the estimates we use here are already proved in the context of continuum elliptic equations and systems in divergence form, cf. [20, 4, 16, 3, 10], and we expect the extension of the other estimates to the continuum setting to be only a technical matter. The use of a functional inequality — though quite convenient to establish sharp error estimates — may not be essential for the qualitative result: in the revised version of [23], the last two authors indeed establish the functional CLT for the homogenization commutator (cf. first part of Theorem 1) below under the assumption of a finite range of dependence of the coefficient field, and a similar conclusion should also follow from the work [1] of Armstrong, Kuusi, and Mourrat. The use of functional inequalities for the path-wise link between the fluctuations of the homogenization commutator and the fluctuations of the solution of the equation with random coefficients (the core result of this work) seems more challenging to by-pass. Let us mention that in a recent revised version of [24], Armstrong, Gu, and Mourrat give a heuristics which also suggests the path-wise character of the fluctuations. This heuristics is based on the variational approach to quantitative homogenization initiated by Armstrong and Smart in [4].

2. Main result and structure of the proof

2.1. **Main result.** We consider a random conductance problem on the integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and let $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,d}$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. We regard $\mathbb{Z}^d$ as a graph with edge set $\mathbb{B} = \{(x,z) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d : |x-z| = 1\}$. For edges $(x,z) \in \mathbb{B}$, we also write $x \sim z$. We define the set of conductances $a(e)$ on the edges $e \in \mathbb{B}$ by $\Omega = [\lambda,1]^{\mathbb{B}}$ for some fixed $0 < \lambda \leq 1$. We equip Ω with the σ-algebra generated by cylinder sets and with a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$, and the associated expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$, variance $\mathrm{var}[\cdot]$, and covariance $\mathrm{cov}[\cdot;\cdot]$. We assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is invariant under the group of transformations $\tau_z : \Omega \to \Omega$ defined by $a(\cdot) \mapsto a(z+\cdot)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and that this group of transformations acts ergodically. A random field $u : \mathbb{R}^d \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be stationary if it is shift-covariant, in the sense that $u(x, \tau_z \boldsymbol{a}) = u(x+z, \boldsymbol{a})$ for all $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{a} \in \Omega$.

A realization $a \in \Omega$ is a countable set $\{a(e)\}_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$ of conductances and is called an environment. We define the elliptic operator $\mathcal{L}$ with coefficients

$$\boldsymbol{a} : x \mapsto \boldsymbol{a}(x) := \mathrm{diag}\,[a(x,x+\mathbf{e}_1), \ldots, a(x,x+\mathbf{e}_d)] \tag{2.1}$$

acting on functions $u : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{L}u : x \mapsto (\mathcal{L}u)(x) := \sum_{z\sim x} a(x,z)(u(z)-u(x)) = -\nabla^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}(x) \nabla u(x),$$

where ∇ denotes the forward discrete gradient $(u : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}) \mapsto (\nabla u : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d)$ defined componentwise by $[\nabla u(x)]_i = u(x + \mathbf{e}_i) - u(x)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and $-\nabla^* \cdot$ denotes its adjoint, with ∇^* the backward discrete gradient $(u : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}) \mapsto (\nabla^* u : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d)$ defined componentwise by $[\nabla^* u(x)]_i = u(x) - u(x - \mathbf{e}_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. To avoid confusion, the continuum gradient is denoted by D.

To state the standard homogenization result [37, 29, 30] for such a discrete PDE, we use the theatrical scaling, and define for all $\varepsilon > 0$ the rescaled operator

$$\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon := -\nabla_\varepsilon^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon \nabla_\varepsilon,$$

where ∇_ε and ∇_ε^* act on functions $u_\varepsilon : \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d := (\varepsilon\mathbb{Z})^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and are defined componentwise by $[\nabla_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x)]_i = \varepsilon^{-1}(u_\varepsilon(x + \varepsilon\mathbf{e}_i) - u_\varepsilon(x))$ and $[\nabla_\varepsilon^* u_\varepsilon(x)]_i = \varepsilon^{-1}(u_\varepsilon(x) - u_\varepsilon(x - \varepsilon\mathbf{e}_i))$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d$, and $\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon(\cdot) := \boldsymbol{a}(\varepsilon\cdot)$. We shall also let ∇_ε and ∇_ε^* act on continuous functions $u : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, so that $\nabla_\varepsilon u$ and $\nabla_\varepsilon^* u$ are continuous functions. If $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $\nabla_\varepsilon u(x)$ and $\nabla_\varepsilon^* u(x)$ converge to $Du(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ let P_ε denote the piecewise constant interpolation at scale ε, that is, $P_\varepsilon : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \to (\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d \to \mathbb{R}^d), f \mapsto P_\varepsilon(f) : \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d \to \mathbb{R}^d, x \mapsto \fint_{x+[-\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\frac{\varepsilon}{2})^d} f(y)dy$. Qualitative stochastic homogenization then ensures that for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (with compact support and mean-value zero for $d = 2$), the solution $u_\varepsilon : \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d \to \mathbb{R}$ of

$$\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon \;=\; P_\varepsilon f \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d, \tag{2.2}$$

converges almost surely (in some discrete weak H^1 topology) to the weak solution $\bar{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of the (continuum) elliptic equation

$$-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D\bar{u} \;=\; f \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}$ is a (symmetric) homogenized matrix characterized by

$$\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} \mathbf{e}_j \;=\; \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j + \nabla\phi_j)(0)\right], \tag{2.3}$$

for all $1 \le i, j \le d$, where $\phi_i : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is the so-called corrector in direction $\mathbf{e}_i$ defined, for almost every realization $\boldsymbol{a}$, as the unique solution of

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{e}_i \cdot x + \phi_i(x, \boldsymbol{a})) \;=\; 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad \phi_i(0, \boldsymbol{a}) = 0, \tag{2.4}$$

such that $\nabla\phi_i$ is stationary. We denote by ϕ the d-dimensional vector with entries ϕ_i for all $1 \le i \le d$. Although it is more natural to consider a symmetric coefficient field $\boldsymbol{a}$ in the discrete setting, symmetry is irrelevant here as no minimization structure is used: all the arguments can be directly adapted to the non-symmetric continuum setting. To emphasize this, we use non-symmetric notation in the statement of the results. In particular, we denote by $\boldsymbol{a}'$ the pointwise transpose field associated with $\boldsymbol{a}$, and denote by ϕ_i' the corrector in direction $\mathbf{e}_i$ associated with the coefficient field $\boldsymbol{a}'$, and note that $(\boldsymbol{a}')_{\rm hom} = (\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom})'$. For symmetric coefficient fields, $\boldsymbol{a}' = \boldsymbol{a}$, $\phi_i' = \phi_i$, and $\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}$ is symmetric.

In this contribution we are mainly interested in the fluctuations of the (properly rescaled versions of the) quantities ϕ_i and u_ε. A crucial role will be played in this analysis by a quantity Ξ, that we call the (standard) *homogenization commutator*. As well-known in applications, homogenization is the rigorous version of averaging fields and fluxes in a consistent way. This is best seen in the very definition of H-convergence by Murat and Tartar [34] which requires weak convergence of the field $Du_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup D\bar{u}$ and weak convergence of the flux $\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D\bar{u}$, to the effect that the following crucial relation holds:

$$\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon - \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} Du_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup 0,$$

which is the mathematical formulation of the so-called Hill-Mandel relation in mechanics [26, 27]. We call homogenization commutator of u_ε the quantity $\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon - \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} Du_\varepsilon$. Applied to the (vectorial) correctors, this takes the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F}(x) : \boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon(\mathrm{Id} + D\phi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}))dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F}(x) : \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}(\mathrm{Id} + D\phi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}))dx \,\to\, 0$$

for all compactly supported test functions $\mathcal{F}$, where we use the notation $a : b = a_{ij}b_{ij}$ for the double contraction (with the Einstein summation convention on repeated indices). This quantity is a natural and intrinsic measure of the accuracy of homogenization for large scale averages (that is, on scales $\gg \varepsilon$), which leads us to the definition of the homogenization commutator of the corrector, a (non-symmetric[1]) $d \times d$-tensorial quantity,

$$\Xi \,:=\, \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id} + D\phi) - \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}(\mathrm{Id} + D\phi),$$

that we shall refer to as the *standard* homogenization commutator. Not surprisingly, this will be the driving quantity for fluctuations in stochastic homogenization, as we quickly argue by reformulating the fluctuations of any solution using its homogenization commutator $\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon - \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} Du_\varepsilon$, which we in turn express in terms of the standard homogenization commutator Ξ (with help of two-scale expansion). Consider the solutions u_ε and $\bar u$ of $-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon = -D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D\bar u = f$. The starting point is the identity

$$\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon \,=\, \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} Du_\varepsilon + (\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon - \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} Du_\varepsilon).$$

By a two-scale expansion, we may rewrite the second RHS term in terms of the homogenization commutator

$$\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon - \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} Du_\varepsilon \,=\, \Xi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) \cdot D\bar u + e(\varepsilon, f),$$

for some two-scale expansion error $e(\varepsilon, f)$. The combination of these identities leads to

$$-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon Du_\varepsilon \,=\, -D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} Du_\varepsilon - D \cdot (\Xi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) \cdot D\bar u + e(\varepsilon, f)).$$

Using the defining equations for u_ε and $\bar u$, this turns into

$$-\, D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D(u_\varepsilon - \bar u) = D \cdot (\Xi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) \cdot D\bar u + e(\varepsilon, f)), \tag{2.5}$$

which we may rewrite in the form

$$-\, D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D(u_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}\,[u_\varepsilon]) = D \cdot (\Xi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) \cdot D\bar u + e(\varepsilon, f) - \mathbb{E}\,[e(\varepsilon, f)]) \tag{2.6}$$

taking the expectation of (2.5) and using that $\mathbb{E}\,[\Xi] = 0$. Testing this equation with $\bar v$ solution of $-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}'_{\rm hom} D\bar v = g$ then yields

$$\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}\,[u_\varepsilon])g \,=\, -\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\bar v \cdot \Xi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) \cdot D\bar u \underbrace{-\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\bar v \cdot (e(\varepsilon, f) - \mathbb{E}\,[e(\varepsilon, f)])}_{\text{error term}}.$$

Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 below show that the error term is of order ε in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ (up to a logarithmic correction in dimension $d = 2$), so that not only the two-scale expansion error of the homogenization commutator is small, but also its rescaled fluctuations. Equation (2.6) should be compared to the heuristics of Armstrong, Gu, and Mourrat in form of

[1] In the case when the coefficients $\boldsymbol{a}$ are symmetric, then Ξ is asymptotically symmetric, which is best seen on its proxy ρ defined in (2.28), cf. Lemma 2.1.

[24, (1.13)] (although this heuristics is based on a variational — in the sense of minimization — interpretation of fluctuations). It is also clear by definiton that $-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D\phi = D\cdot\Xi$ and that $\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id}+D\phi)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} = \Xi - \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D\phi$, so that $\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D\phi$ is the Helmholtz projection and $\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id}+D\phi)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}$ is the Leray projection of Ξ with respect to the homogenized operator $-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D$ (this relation only holds up to discretization errors in the discrete setting).

In the discrete setting of this article, the standard homogenization commutator takes the form

$$\Xi := \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi). \tag{2.7}$$

In what follows, for all $\varepsilon>0$ and $m\in\mathbb{N}$, we extend maps $v:\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d\to\mathbb{R}^m$ to piecewise constant maps (still denoted by v) $\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^m$ by setting $v|_{x+[-\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\frac{\varepsilon}{2})^d}\equiv v(x)$ for all $x\in\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d$. We use this notation for $\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}):\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d\to\mathbb{R}^d$, $\Xi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}):\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d\to\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, and $\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon:\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d\to\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$. More precisely, we shall study the asymptotic behavior as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ of two families of random distributions:

$$I_1^\varepsilon : C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}\ni\mathcal{F}\mapsto I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}),$$
$$I_2^\varepsilon : C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^2\ni(\bar u,\bar v)\mapsto I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v).$$

I_1^ε is a tensorial (linear) distribution and I_2^ε is a scalar bilinear distribution. We start with the definition of I_1^ε, which simply encodes the homogenization commutator (as opposed to I_2^ε, this is simple):

$$I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}) := \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):\Xi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})dx. \tag{2.8}$$

To properly define I_2^ε, which is to capture the fluctuations of any solution of the PDE with a localized RHS, we need to introduce some auxiliary functions. For all $\bar u,\bar v\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\varepsilon>0$, we define $f_\varepsilon,g_\varepsilon\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$f_\varepsilon := -\nabla_\varepsilon^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla_\varepsilon\bar u,\ g_\varepsilon := -\nabla_\varepsilon^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}'_{\rm hom}\nabla_\varepsilon\bar v,, \tag{2.9}$$

and shall use the notation $(f_\varepsilon,\bar u)$ and $(g_\varepsilon,\bar v)$ exclusively for pairs of (decaying) functions related by (2.9). For all such $(f_\varepsilon,\bar u)$ and $(g_\varepsilon,\bar v)$, we also define the solutions $u_\varepsilon,v_\varepsilon:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ of[2]

$$-\nabla_\varepsilon^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon\nabla_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon = f_\varepsilon,\qquad -\nabla_\varepsilon^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}'_\varepsilon\nabla_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon = g_\varepsilon. \tag{2.10}$$

Note that the definition of u_ε differs from (2.2), and shall be the only definition used in the sequel; this allows us to distinguish fluctuations from errors due to discretization. The random distribution I_2^ε involves the solutions u_ε and v_ε of (2.10) (where u_ε and v_ε are seen as functions of f_ε and g_ε, which are themselves related to $\bar u$ and $\bar v$ through (2.9)):

$$I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v) := \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\nabla_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon(x)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon\nabla_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x)-\mathbb{E}\left[\nabla_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon(x)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon\nabla_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x)\right])dx. \tag{2.11}$$

The extension of functions on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d$ by piecewise constant functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and the definition (2.10) allow us to state the main result of this paper, Theorem 1 below, in a form that is expected to hold mutatis mutandis in the continuum setting.

[2]These functions are well-defined: for all $x\in[-\frac12,\frac12)^d$, the equations for $u_\varepsilon(\varepsilon x+\cdot)$ and $v_\varepsilon(\varepsilon x+\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d$ are well-posed since $f_\varepsilon(\varepsilon x+\cdot)$ and $g_\varepsilon(\varepsilon x+\cdot)$ are in $L^2(\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon^d)$, and have compact support and mean-value zero for $d=2$.

Before we state our main result, let us explain why I_2^ε indeed captures the fluctuations of any solution of the PDE with a localized RHS (cf. Appendix B that precisely makes the connection between the natural definitions of this quantity and the one needed for a clean quantitative statement of the results). For this discussion we consider the continuum setting, for which the definitions of I_2^ε is more natural (recall that in the discrete setting, f_ε and g_ε are deterministic and uniformly close to $f=-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D\bar u$ and $g=-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D\bar v$). By definition of u_ε and v_ε, one may rewrite I_2^ε in the form:

$$I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)\,=\,\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(u_\varepsilon(x)-\mathbb{E}\,[u_\varepsilon(x)])g(x)dx\,=\,\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(v_\varepsilon(x)-\mathbb{E}\,[v_\varepsilon(x)])f(x)dx,$$

and it was essentially proved in [12, 31] that $\mathrm{var}\,[I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)]\le C(\bar u,\bar v)<\infty$ uniformly w.r.t. ε, so that I_2^ε has indeed the right scaling.

Let us give now a motivation for the fact that I_1^ε is expected to converge to a white noise. Both in [6] and [19], the quantity for which a CLT was proved to hold is of the form

$$I_L:=(2L)^{-d}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\cap[-L,L)^d}\Big((\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i'^L)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j^L)(x)-\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},L}\mathbf{e}_j\Big)(x),\qquad(2.12)$$

where for all $L\in\mathbb{N}$, $\phi_i'^L,\phi_j^L$ are suitable approximations of the correctors on the discrete box $\mathbb{Z}^d\cap[-L,L)^d$ (by Dirichlet and periodic boundary data, respectively), and $\boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},L}$ makes this quantity of vanishing expectation. Using the weak form of the equations of these approximations of the corrector, one may rewrite the above as

$$I_L\;=\;(2L)^{-d}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\cap[-L,L)^d}\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\Big(\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j^L)-\boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},L}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j^L)\Big)(x),$$

which is an approximation of the spatial average of Ξ (with test function 1). The correct quantity is Ξ and not the "energy density" of the corrector $(\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i'^L)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j^L)$, which may explain why no Green-Kubo formula could be derived from the CLT for I_L in [19] (we only expect a Green-Kubo formula to hold for Ξ).

In the rest of this paper, we assume that $d\ge2$ and that the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ is a product measure, e.g. the conductances $\boldsymbol{a}$ are i.i.d. random variables. Our main result shows that the fluctuation of the random distributions I_2^ε are driven by the fluctuations of I_1^ε (in the strong $L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$ sense), and that the latter converges in law (and even in Wasserstein distance) to a Gaussian white noise for all $d\ge2$. This extends and unifies [19, 33, 32, 24] in a path-wise sense, and yields the first complete results in the critical dimension $d=2$. We recall the definition of the Wasserstein distance between random variables. Let γ_1 and γ_2 denote two random variables, and denote by $\tilde\gamma_1$ and $\tilde\gamma_2$ their laws, the Wasserstein distance $d_W(\gamma_1,\gamma_2)$ between γ_1 and γ_2 is given by

$$d_W(\gamma_1,\gamma_2)\;:=\sup_{\psi,\|\psi\|_{Lip}\le1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\psi(x)(d\tilde\gamma_1-d\tilde\gamma_2)(x),\qquad(2.13)$$

where $\|\psi\|_{Lip}$ denotes the supremum norm of the distributional derivative of ψ.

Theorem 1. *Let $d\ge2$ and let $\mathbb{P}$ be a product measure $\mathbb{P}=\pi^{\otimes\mathbb{B}}$ where π is a nontrivial Borel probability measure on $[\lambda,1]$, and let $\boldsymbol{a}$, $\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}$, $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1,\dots,d}$, ρ, I_1^ε and I_2^ε be as in* (2.1), (2.3), (2.4), (2.8), *and* (2.11). *Then, there exists a non-degenerate symmetric*[3] *positive*

[3]Since $\mathcal{Q}$ is a (limiting) covariance, it is of course symmetric in the sense that $\mathcal{Q}_{ijkl}=\mathcal{Q}_{klij}$. If the coefficients $\boldsymbol{a}$ are symmetric, it has the additional symmetry $\mathcal{Q}_{ijkl}=\mathcal{Q}_{jikl}$ (hence $\mathcal{Q}_{ijkl}=\mathcal{Q}_{ijlk}$).

semi-definite fourth-order tensor $\mathcal{Q}$ such that for all $\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\operatorname{cov}\left[I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F});I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{G})\right] \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):\mathcal{Q}:\mathcal{G}(x)dx. \tag{2.14}$$

Let Γ denote an $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$-valued Gaussian white noise with intensity $\mathcal{Q}$, that is, the Gaussian random distribution with zero expectation $\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma(\mathcal{F})\right]=0$ and covariance structure given by $\operatorname{cov}\left[\Gamma(\mathcal{F});\Gamma(\mathcal{G})\right]=\int\mathcal{F}:\mathcal{Q}:\mathcal{G}$ for all $\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The rescaled homogenization commutator $\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\Xi(\varepsilon^{-1}\cdot)$ satisfies a functional CLT in the sense that (the law of) I_1^ε converges to (the law of) Γ in the Wasserstein distance: for all $\mathcal{F}\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}d_W\Big(I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}),\Gamma(\mathcal{F})\Big) \;=\; 0. \tag{2.15}$$

In addition, for all $\varepsilon>0$, and all $\bar u,\bar v\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\|I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)+I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar v\otimes D\bar u)\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})} \;=\; 0. \tag{2.16}$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}d_W\Big(I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v),\Gamma(D\bar v\otimes D\bar u)\Big) \;=\; 0. \tag{2.17}$$

□

A reformulation of Theorem 1 yields the following corollary for the Helmholtz and Leray projections of the homogenization commutator:

Corollary 1. *Let the assumptions and notation of Theorem 1 hold. We consider the field and the flux/current of the (vectorial) corrector as encoded by the random distributions*

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}) &:= -\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x):\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})dx,\\ I_4^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}) &:= \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x):\Big(\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}))-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\Big)dx. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we restrict ourselves to test functions $\mathcal{F}$ which are of the form $\mathcal{F}=DV+(\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}^{-1})'D\times W$ with $V\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$ and $W\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$, and define for all $\varepsilon>0$ the discrete interpolation $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon:=\nabla_\varepsilon V+(\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}^{-1})'\nabla_\varepsilon\times W\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$, where $D\times$ and $\nabla_\varepsilon\times$ are a short-hand notation for the rotational of a tensor field (acting on the first index). Then we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\|I_3^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})-I_1^\varepsilon(DV)\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})} \;=\; 0, \tag{2.18}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\|I_4^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})-I_1^\varepsilon((\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}^{-1})'D\times W)\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})} \;=\; 0, \tag{2.19}$$

which means that, up to discretization errors, the field of the corrector coincides path-wise with the Helmholtz projection of Ξ and the current is coincides path-wise with the Leray projection of Ξ, where both projections are meant wrt to the constant coefficient $\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}$. □

Remark 2.1. As already mentioned in the introduction, the CLT for the homogenization commutator and Corollary 1 can be extended to the case of finite range of dependence, cf. the revised version of [20] based on a semi-group approach. We believe a similar result can be proved using the variational approach of Armstrong, Kuusi and Mourrat [1]. □

Let us comment on Theorem 1, and point out some consequences of its proof:

- The error $I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)+I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar v\otimes D\bar u)$ in (2.16) is explicit, cf. Proposition 3. In order to highlight the rich structure of the problem, we display the more natural form it takes in the continuum setting. Let $\bar u,\bar v\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and set $\bar u_\varepsilon:=\bar u(\varepsilon\cdot),\bar v_\varepsilon:=\bar v(\varepsilon\cdot)$. We define the two-scale expansion errors $w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}$ and $w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}$ as solutions of
$$\begin{aligned}-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar u,\varepsilon}&=D\cdot((\boldsymbol{a}\phi_j-\sigma_j)DD_j\bar u_\varepsilon),\\ -D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}'Dw_{\bar v,\varepsilon}&=D\cdot((\boldsymbol{a}'\phi_j'-\sigma_j')DD_j\bar v_\varepsilon),\end{aligned}$$
where σ is the flux corrector (see (2.36)—(2.39) below), and σ' the flux corrector associated with $\boldsymbol{a}'$. Then we have
$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon^{2-\frac d2}(I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)+I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar v\otimes D\bar u))\\ =\;&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}Dw_{\bar v,\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar u,\varepsilon}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k'\phi_jDD_k\bar v_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}DD_j\bar u_\varepsilon\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_jDD_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k')D_k\bar v_\varepsilon-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k'DD_k\bar v_\varepsilon\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_j)D_j\bar u_\varepsilon\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}D_k\bar v_\varepsilon D\phi_k'\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_j)D_j\bar u_\varepsilon-E_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v),\end{aligned}\tag{2.20}$$
where $E_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)$ is the expectation of the first five RHS terms of (2.20).
- Statement (2.18) shows that the corrector (for $d>2$) converges in the Wasserstein distance to the variant $D\cdot(-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}'_{\rm hom}D)^{-1}\Gamma$ of the Gaussian free field. This variant involves both $\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$. As pointed out in [33], it is easy to see in Fourier space that it does not coincide with the standard Gaussian free field in general (unless the compatibility condition $\mathcal{Q}_{ijkl}=c_{jl}(\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom})_{ik}$ is satisfied for some tensor c). Since in the critical dimension $d=2$ the whole-space massless Gaussian free field is not well-defined (only its gradient is), this implies the non-existence of stationary correctors for $d=2$.
- With the notation $Q_L=[-L,L)^d$, the proof of (2.14) yields the following Green-Kubo formula for all $1\le i,j,k,l\le d$ and all $d\ge2$
$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\int_{Q_{2L}}\frac{|Q_L\cap(x+Q_L)|}{|Q_L|}{\rm cov}\left[\Xi_{ij}(x);\Xi_{kl}(0)\right]dx\;=\;\mathcal{Q}_{ijkl}.\tag{2.21}$$
- The fourth-order tensor $\mathcal{Q}$ is non-degenerate in the sense that there exists $\underline{\nu}>0$ such that for all unit vectors $\mathbf{e}$, $\mathbf{e}\otimes\mathbf{e}:\mathcal{Q}:\mathbf{e}\otimes\mathbf{e}\ge\underline{\nu}$, cf. Lemma 3.7 below.
- Based on functional inequalities, our approach to the proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 allows to quantify the convergence in (2.15), (2.16), (2.17), (2.18), and (2.19). For all $\bar u,\bar v\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $\mathcal{F}=DV+(\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}^{-1})'D\times W$ with $V\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$ and $W\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$
$$\begin{aligned}\|I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)+I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar v\otimes D\bar u)\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})}&\lesssim_{\bar u,\bar v}\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon),\\ \|I_3^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})-I_1^\varepsilon(DV)\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})}&\lesssim_V\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12},\\ \|I_4^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})-I_1^\varepsilon((\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}^{-1})'D\times W)\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})}&\lesssim_W\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12},\end{aligned}\tag{2.22}$$
where $\mu_d(\varepsilon)=1$ for $d>2$ and $\mu_d(\varepsilon)=|\log\varepsilon|+1$ for $d=2$, and where here and in the sequel the notation $\lesssim_\gamma$ means $\le$ up to a multiplicative constant that only depends on the dimension d, the ellipticity contrast λ, the constant in the covariance estimate (cf. Lemma 3.1), and on the subscript γ (typically on norms of γ if γ is a function — as it is here: $\gamma=(\bar u,\bar v)$, V, or W). The above estimates

are stated and proved in $L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$ for simplicity, but the same arguments yield similar estimates for all algebraic moments and even for stretched exponential ones (cf. [17, 20]). In addition, for all $\mathcal{F}\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$, if $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}:\mathcal{Q}:\mathcal{F}\neq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}D\bar v\otimes D\bar u:\mathcal{Q}:D\bar v\otimes D\bar u\neq 0$, we have

$$d_W\Big(I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}),\Gamma(\mathcal{F})\Big)\quad\lesssim_{\mathcal{F}}\quad\max\{\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}},\varepsilon\}=\begin{cases}\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} & :\ d=2,\\ \varepsilon^{\frac{6}{7}} & :\ d=3,\\ \varepsilon & :\ d\geq 4,\end{cases}\tag{2.23}$$

$$d_W\Big(I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v),\Gamma(D\bar v\otimes D\bar u)\Big)\quad\lesssim_{\bar u,\bar v}\quad\max\{\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}},\varepsilon\}.\tag{2.24}$$

In the case when $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}:\mathcal{Q}:\mathcal{F}=0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}D\bar v\otimes D\bar u:\mathcal{Q}:D\bar v\otimes D\bar u=0$, we have instead:

$$\|I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,\|I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\lesssim_{\mathcal{F},\bar u,\bar v}\max\{\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}},\varepsilon\}.$$

Similar statements obviously hold for I_3^ε and I_4^ε.

As noticed by Gu and Mourrat in [24], it is not correct to substitute u_ε by its standard two-scale expansion when it comes to fluctuations. In dimensions $d>2$, both the fluctuations of u_ε and of its two-scale expansion $\bar u+\varepsilon\nabla\bar u\cdot\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})$ are characterized by Theorem 1. Let us denote by $H_{\rm hom}$ the operator $D(-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D)^{-1}$ and $H'_{\rm hom}$ the operator $D(-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}'_{\rm hom}D)^{-1}$. Whereas the rescaled fluctuations of $\int(u_\varepsilon-\mathbb{E}\,[u_\varepsilon])g$ are asymptotically described by $-\Gamma(H'_{\rm hom}(g)\otimes H_{\rm hom}(f))$, an elementary calculation based on (2.18) shows that the rescaled fluctuations of $\varepsilon\int g\nabla\bar u\cdot\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})$ are asymptotically described by $-\Gamma(H'_{\rm hom}(gH_{\rm hom}(f)))\neq-\Gamma(H'_{\rm hom}(g)\otimes H_{\rm hom}(f))$. In view of the discussion based on (2.6), the correct approach is to first express fluctuations of any solution in terms of its commutator, and then appeal to the two-scale expansion to express this commutator in terms of the standard commutator Ξ. Whereas the fluctuations of the two-scale expansion error of u_ε are not small with respect to the fluctuations of u_ε itself, the fluctuations of the two-scale expansion error of the homogenization commutator of u_ε are small with respect to the fluctuations of the homogenization commutator of u_ε itself. The following corollary reformulates Theorem 1 in terms of a new (nonlocal) two-scale expansion for u_ε based on the homogenization commutator that captures correctly the local fluctuations of the solution.

Corollary 2. *Let the assumptions and notation of Theorem 1 hold. For all $\bar u\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varepsilon>0$ we set*

$$r_\varepsilon(x,\bar u):=u_\varepsilon(x)-\Big(\underbrace{\mathbb{E}\,[u_\varepsilon]+(-\nabla_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla_\varepsilon)^{-1}(\nabla_\varepsilon^*\cdot(\Xi_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla_\varepsilon\bar u))}_{\text{(nonlocal) two-scale expansion}}\Big)(x),$$

where $\Xi_\varepsilon:=\Xi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})$. Then, this (nonlocal) two-scale expansion correctly captures

- *the* spatial *oscillations of ∇u_ε in a strong norm:*

$$\|\nabla_\varepsilon r_\varepsilon(\bar u)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{P}\times dx)}\lesssim_{\bar u}\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12};\tag{2.25}$$

- *the* random *fluctuations of u_ε in the CLT-scaling: for all $\bar v\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g_\varepsilon=-\nabla_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}'_{\rm hom}\nabla_\varepsilon\bar v$,*

$$\Big\|\varepsilon^{-\frac d2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}r_\varepsilon(\bar u)g_\varepsilon\Big\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})}\lesssim_{\bar u,\bar v}\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon).\tag{2.26}$$

□

Estimate (2.26) is a reformulation of Theorem 1 in the form of (2.22), using the discrete version of (2.6). Estimate (2.25) is essentially a corollary of [17] or [16, Corollary 3] (which treats the continuum setting), which, with the notation of (2.6), implies $(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathrm{var}\,[e(\varepsilon,f)])^{\frac12} \lesssim_{\bar u} \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}$, and therefore yields (2.25).

Note that [24] treats a variant of I_2^ε which only coincides with I_2^ε up to (mainly) *deterministic* discretization errors, and allow to regard f and g as primary variables (as desirable in applications, as opposed to assumptions on $\bar u$, $\bar v$). For completeness, we quickly explain in Appendix B the approximation arguments needed to recover these results from Theorem 1.

2.2. **Structure of the proof and auxiliary results.** In the rest of the paper, we use that $\boldsymbol{a}$ is symmetric in the notation. Theorem 1 follows from the combination of three results:

- the characterization of the covariance structure and the Green-Kubo formula for the homogenization commutator Ξ, cf. Proposition 1;
- a functional normal approximation result for Ξ, cf. Proposition 2;
- the rewriting of I_2^ε in terms of I_1^ε and the control of the error, cf. Proposition 3;

We start with the characterization of the covariance structure. In what follows we use the notation Q_L both for $[-L,L)^d$ and $[-L,L)^d\cap\mathbb{Z}^d$ (and the slight abuse of notation $Q:=[-\frac12,\frac12)^d$), and denote by $|A|$ the cardinality of A if A is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and the Lebesgue measure of A if A is a measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Likewise, the notation $\int_A dx$ stands both for sum over $x\in A$ and integral over $x\in A$, depending on the context. For all $\varepsilon>0$, the notation $\int_{A\cap\mathbb{Z}^d_\varepsilon} dx$ stands for $\varepsilon^d\sum_{x\in A\cap\mathbb{Z}^d_\varepsilon}$ (in particular, dx contains the Jacobian ε^d so that $\int_{A\cap\mathbb{Z}^d_\varepsilon} dx$ converges to $\int_A dx$ as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$). In order to make the adaptation of the arguments straightforward in the continuum setting we do not appeal to discrete $L^p-L^q(\mathbb{Z}^d)$-estimates, and "distinguish" between the Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ (which coincide with $L^p(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$). In dimension $d=2$ we shall need a weighted norm and we define the space $W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as the subspace of functions $w\in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|w\|_{W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb{R}^d)}<\infty$, where

$$\|w\|_{W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb{R}^d)}=\begin{cases}\|w\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} & :\ d>2,\\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big(|w(x)|+\log(2+|x|)^{\frac12}|Dw(x)|\big)dx & :\ d=2.\end{cases}$$

For $\alpha>0$, $k\geq 0$ and $q\geq 1$, we further define the space $W^{k,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (and $H^k_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d):=W^{k,2}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $L^q_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)=W^{0,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$) as the subspace of functions $w\in W^{k,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|w\|_{W^{k,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}:=\sum_{j=0}^k\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D^j w\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}<\infty. \tag{2.27}$$

In order to establish the functional CLT for I_1^ε, we do not directly work with Ξ, and rather use a proxy $\rho:\mathbb{Z}^d\to\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ (which is symmetric if $\boldsymbol{a}$ is symmetric) defined componentwise by (with non-symmetric notation in this definition only, with the application to continuum equations in mind)

$$\rho_{ij}:=(\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i')\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)-\nabla\phi_i'\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_j-\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi_j-\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_j. \tag{2.28}$$

We then define the corresponding proxy $\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon$ for I_1^ε: for all $\mathcal{F} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$, we set

$$\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}) \,=\, \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F}(x) : \rho(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}) dx. \tag{2.29}$$

This proxy for the homogenization commutator is precise enough in the CLT scaling as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 2.1. *For all $q > 2$ and $\alpha > 0$, we have for all $\mathcal{F} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$,*

$$\|I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}) - \tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})} \,\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\, \varepsilon \mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\mathcal{F}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

□

Remark 2.2. In order to develop a quantitative theory of stochastic homogenization, Armstrong, Kuusi and Mourrat recently introduce a variational quantity, cf. [1, (1.9)]. The *stationary* version $J(p,q)$ of this *non-stationary* quantity turns out to be a variant of the homogenization commutator. Indeed, for the choice $q-p = \mathbf{e}_i$ and $p = \mathbf{e}_j$ and for symmetric coefficients,

$$\begin{aligned} J(p,q) &= -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{e}_i + \nabla\phi_i)\cdot \boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i) + (\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i)\cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\Big(\rho_{ii} + 2\Xi_{ji} - \mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_i\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, this particular combination of the two forms of the homogenization commutator introduced here has a variational interpretation if $\boldsymbol{a}$ is symmetric, cf. [1] — this variational structure is also clear in the approximation I_L of the homogenized coefficients by periodization, cf. (2.12), although it was not taken advantage of in [19]. □

In particular, the functional CLT for I_1^ε will follow from a functional CLT for $\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon$, which we state in the following propositions.

Proposition 1. *There exists a non-degenerate symmetric positive semi-definite fourth-order tensor $\mathcal{Q}$ such that for all $\alpha > 0$ and $q > 2$ small enough, and for all $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in (H^1 \cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d))^{d\times d}$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \operatorname{cov}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}); \tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{G})\Big] \,=\, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F}(x) : \mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{G}(x) dx. \tag{2.30}$$

In addition, it satisfies for all $1 \le i,j,k,l \le d$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{ijkl} &= \lim_{L\uparrow\infty} \int_{Q_L} \fint_{Q_L} \operatorname{cov}\left[\rho_{ij}(x); \rho_{kl}(y)\right] dxdy \\ &= \lim_{L\uparrow\infty} \int_{Q_{2L}} \frac{|Q_L \cap (x+Q_L)|}{|Q_L|} \operatorname{cov}\left[\rho_{ij}(x); \rho_{kl}(0)\right] dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

□

Note that (2.31) is the usual form of the Green-Kubo formula (in view of Lemma 2.1, ρ may be replaced by the standard homogenization commutator Ξ). The proof of Proposition 1, displayed in Subsection 3, has the same global structure as for the periodic approximation in [19], and involves in addition the flux corrector (see (2.36) below). It

defines $\mathcal{Q}$ by a quantitative compactness argument, as the limit of a suitable Cauchy sequence. In particular, the qualitative convergence result (2.30) can be strengthened as follows: for all $\alpha > 0$ and $q > 2$,

$$\Big|\mathrm{cov}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F});\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{G})\Big] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):\mathcal{Q}:\mathcal{G}(x)dx\Big| \\ \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \big(\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}} + \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\big)\big(\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\big)^2. \quad (2.32)$$

If $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are indicator functions $\mathcal{F} = 1_Q\mathbf{e}_i\otimes\mathbf{e}_j$ and $\mathcal{G} = 1_Q\mathbf{e}_k\otimes\mathbf{e}_l$, then a similar result holds in the form of the quantitative Green-Kubo formula (where we may use Ξ in place of ρ)

$$\Big|\mathcal{Q}_{ijkl} - \int_{Q_L}\fint_{Q_L}\mathrm{cov}\left[\Xi_{ij}(x);\Xi_{kl}(y)\right]dxdy\Big| \lesssim L^{-\frac{d}{d+2}}. \quad (2.33)$$

Note that in the continuum setting the latter estimate would only hold in the slightly different form

$$\Big|\mathcal{Q}_{ijkl} - \frac{1}{\kappa^2}\int_{Q_L}\eta_L(y)\fint_{Q_L}\eta_L(x)\mathrm{cov}\left[\Xi_{ij}(x);\Xi_{kl}(y)\right]dxdy\Big| \lesssim L^{-\frac{d}{d+2}},$$

where the cut-off function $\eta_L:\mathbb{R}^d\to[0,1]$ satisfies $\eta_L|_{Q_{L-1}}\equiv 1$, $\eta_L|_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus Q_L}\equiv 0$, $|D\eta_L|\lesssim 1$, and has mass $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_L\sim L^d$. The proof of the non-degeneracy of $\mathcal{Q}$ essentially follows an argument by Wehr, cf. [41, 19].

The second result concerns the normal approximation of $\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon$. Let us first introduce some terminology. Given random distributions (that is, $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$-valued random maps) $(X_n)_n$ and X, we say that X_n converges weakly-* to X if the random variable $X_n(\mathcal{F}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}X_n:\mathcal{F}$ converges in distribution to $X(\mathcal{F}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}X:\mathcal{F}$ for any $\mathcal{F}\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$. Let Γ denote an $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$-valued Gaussian white noise with intensity $\mathcal{Q}$, as defined in the statement of Theorem 1 (see also e.g. [28, Chapter 17]). Note that Γ can be extended to test functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$. An argument à la Stein, cf. [7, 36, 19], yields the following quantitative normal approximation result.

Proposition 2. *Denote by $\mathcal{N}$ a standard normal random variable. Then, for all $\mathcal{F}\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$ such that $\liminf_{\varepsilon\downarrow0}\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]>0$, we have for all $\varepsilon>0$*

$$d_W\left(\frac{\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]}};\mathcal{N}\right) \lesssim_{\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{F})} \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac d2}(1+|\log\varepsilon|)}{\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]^{\frac32}}(\|\mathcal{F}\|^2_{W^{1,4}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{F}\|^3_{W^{1,3}(\mathbb{R}^d)}), \quad (2.34)$$

where the multiplicative constant only depends on $\mathcal{F}$ through the size of its support. If $\mathcal{F}\in(W^{1,1}_{\log}\cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^d))^{d\times d}$ is such that $\liminf_{\varepsilon\downarrow0}\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]>0$ but is not compactly supported, we have the slightly worse estimate for all $\varepsilon>0$

$$d_W\left(\frac{\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]}};\mathcal{N}\right) \lesssim_{\mathcal{F}} \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac d2}(1+|\log\varepsilon|)^3}{\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]^{\frac32}}\|\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (2.35)$$

where the multiplicative constant only depends on $\mathcal{F}$ through some power of its $W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$-norm. □

The RHS of (2.34) in Proposition 1 has the same scaling as in [19], but strongly relies on the fact that $\mathcal{F}$ is compactly supported. The second estimate (2.35) is needed for Appendix B, in which case the function $D\bar{u}\otimes D\bar{v}$ is not compactly supported. Combined with Proposition 1, this directly yields the desired functional CLT for I_1^ε, as stated in Theorem 1.

Corollary 3. *Seen as a random distribution, I_1^ε converges weakly-* to Γ as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$. Moreover, for all $\mathcal{F}\in(W^{1,1}_{\log}\cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^d))^{d\times d}$ such that $\nu_{\mathcal{F}}:=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}:\mathcal{Q}:\mathcal{F}\neq 0$, we have for all $\varepsilon>0$*

$$d_W\Big(\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F});\Gamma(\mathcal{F})\Big)\lesssim_{\mathcal{F}}\frac{|\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]-\nu_{\mathcal{F}}|}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]}+\sqrt{\nu_{\mathcal{F}}}}+\frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}(1+|\log\varepsilon|)^3}{\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big]},$$

where the multiplicative constant depends on $\mathcal{F}$ only through its $(W^{1,1}_{\log}\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))^{d\times d}$-norm. In particular, in view of (2.32), for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough and for all $\mathcal{F}\in(W^{1,1}_{\log}\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))^{d\times d}$ such that $\nu_{\mathcal{F}}\neq 0$, we have for all $\varepsilon>0$

$$d_W\Big(\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F});\Gamma(\mathcal{F})\Big)\lesssim_{\mathcal{F}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_{\mathcal{F}}}}\big(\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}}+\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\big)+\frac{1}{\nu_{\mathcal{F}}}\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}(1+|\log\varepsilon|^3),$$

where the multiplicative constant depends on $\mathcal{F}$ only through its $(W^{1,1}_{\log}\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))^{d\times d}$-norm. □

The main novelty of this paper are the following proposition, which shows that the asymptotic behavior of the main quantitiy of interest in stochastic homogenization, namely I_2^ε is driven by the standard homogenization commutator I_1^ε. In order to state this result properly, we need to recall the notion of flux corrector σ, which was recently introduced in [16] and crucially used in [23], and allows one to put the homogenization error (that is, the difference between u_ε and the first two terms of the two-scale expansion) in divergence form. Let $\sigma=\{\sigma_{ijk}\}_{1\le i,j,k\le d}$ be the third-order tensor defined as the unique solution (such that $\nabla\sigma$ is stationary and $\sigma(0)=0$) of

$$-\triangle\sigma_{ijk}:=-\nabla^*\cdot\nabla\sigma_{ijk}=\nabla_j q_{ik}-\nabla_k q_{ij},\tag{2.36}$$

where the flux $\{q_{ij}\}_{i,j=1,\cdots,d}$ is given by

$$q_i=\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_i+\mathbf{e}_i)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbf{e}_i.\tag{2.37}$$

Note that the field σ is skew-symmetric in its last indices, that is,

$$\sigma_{ijk}=-\sigma_{ikj}.\tag{2.38}$$

It satisfies for all $1\le i\le d$,

$$\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_i:=\sum_{j=1}^d\Big(\sum_{k=1}^d\nabla_k^*\sigma_{ijk}\Big)\mathbf{e}_j=q_i.\tag{2.39}$$

We are in the position to give the discrete version of (2.20):

Proposition 3. *Let $d \geq 2$. For all $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, set $\bar{u}_\varepsilon := \bar{u}(\varepsilon\cdot), \bar{v}_\varepsilon := \bar{v}(\varepsilon\cdot)$, and for all $\varepsilon > 0$, let $w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}, w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be the solutions of*

$$-\nabla^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon} = \nabla^* \cdot ((\boldsymbol{a}\phi_j - \sigma_j)\nabla\nabla_j \bar{u}_\varepsilon) - \nabla_k^*\nabla_l^*(\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon) + \nabla^* \cdot (\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon),$$
$$-\nabla^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon} = \nabla^* \cdot ((\boldsymbol{a}\phi_m - \sigma_m)\nabla\nabla_m \bar{v}_\varepsilon) - \nabla_n^*\nabla_r^*(\sigma_{mnr}\nabla_r\nabla_m\bar{v}_\varepsilon) + \nabla^* \cdot (\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_n\nabla_n\phi_m\nabla_n\nabla_m\bar{v}_\varepsilon).$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^{2-\frac{d}{2}}\tilde{J}_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v})\\
&:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon\\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_j\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon\\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\mathbf{e}_l\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\mathbf{e}_m\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)(\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon)\\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j + \phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k + \nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\\
&\quad - E_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v}),
\end{aligned}\tag{2.40}$$

where $E_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v})$ is the expectation of the first eight RHS terms of (2.40) (so that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{J}_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v})] = 0$), and set

$$\bar{J}_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v}) := I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar{v}\otimes D\bar{u}) - I_1^\varepsilon(\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{v}\otimes\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{u}).$$

Then, with $J_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v}) := \tilde{J}_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v}) + \bar{J}_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v})$, we have the decomposition

$$I_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v}) = -I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar{v}\otimes D\bar{u}) + J_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v}),\tag{2.41}$$

and for all $0 < \alpha \ll 1$, $0 < q - 2 \ll 1$ small enough, and $p \gg 1$ large enough, we have for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|J_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})} \lesssim \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)\Big(&\|D\bar{u}\|_{W^{2,4}\cap W^{2,2q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|D\bar{v}\|_{W^{2,4}\cap W^{2,2q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
&+ \|D^2\bar{v}\|_{L^2_{1+\alpha}\cap L^p_{1+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|D^2\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2_{1+\alpha}\cap L^p_{1+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{2.42}$$

□

Theorem 1 is now a straightforward consequence of Corollary 3, and Proposition 3. The quantitative estimates (2.23) and (2.24) follow from Corollary 3 and (2.42).

3. Limiting covariance structure of the homogenization commutator

3.1. **Auxiliary lemmas and proof of Proposition 1.** The main tool to prove Proposition 1 is the following covariance estimate (see e.g. [22, Lemma 3]), which holds for any product measure $\mathbb{P}$ on Ω. Let us first fix some notation. Let X be a random variable $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, that is, a function of $\{a(e)\}_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$. For all $e \in \mathbb{B}$ we denote by $\boldsymbol{a}^e$ the random field that coincides with $\boldsymbol{a}$ on all edges $e' \neq e$, and such that $a^e(e)$ is an independent copy of $a(e)$. In particular, $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}^e$ have the same law. We use the abbreviation $X^e = X(\boldsymbol{a}^e)$

and $X = X(\boldsymbol{a})$, and define the difference operator $\Delta_e : X \mapsto X^e - X$, which we call the Glauber vertical derivative at edge e (with a slight abuse of terminology).

Lemma 3.1. *For all $X, Y \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$,*

$$\operatorname{cov}[X;Y] \lesssim \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e X|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e Y|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.1}$$

□

When applying this lemma to the argument of the limit in the RHS of (2.31), we end up with the bound

$$\int_{Q_{2L}} \frac{|Q_L \cap (x+Q_L)|}{|Q_L|} |\operatorname{cov}[\rho_{ij}(x); \rho_{kl}(0)]|dx \lesssim \log L,$$

which is sharp. The difficulty in Proposition 1 is that, as in general for Green-Kubo formulas, the covariance is not an integrable function, and cancellations have to be unravelled in some way. In [33], for a similar problem, Mourrat and the third author make use of the Helffer-Sjöstrand formula which yields an exact formula for covariances and allows to unravel cancellations through integrations by parts (which is not possible with the covariance estimate). This tool is however limited (especially in the continuum setting) and qualitative. Instead, we shall use the quantitative compactness argument introduced by Nolen and the second author in [19].

We start with the proof of (2.30), and shall indicate the modifications for the proof of (2.31) at the end of this subsection. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$ be fixed, and set

$$\nu_\varepsilon := \operatorname{cov}\left[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}); \tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{G})\right].$$

The aim is to prove that there exists a fourth-order tensor $\mathcal{Q}$ (independent of $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$) such that

$$\nu := \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \nu_\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F}(x) : \mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{G}(x) dx. \tag{3.2}$$

This result contains two statements: the existence of the limit ν of ν_ε, and the identification of the limit (quadratic form, tensor $\mathcal{Q}$). The argument goes as follows. We shall introduce an approximation $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$ of ν_ε for all $T > 0$ with the following properties:

- the limit ν_T of $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ exists and can be identified using the covariance estimate, it has the desired form of the RHS of (3.2) (for some fourth-order tensor $\mathcal{Q}_T$), and $\nu_{\varepsilon,T} - \nu_T$ can be quantified (although $\mathcal{Q}_T$ may not be bounded uniformly w.r.t. T a priori);
- the approximation error $\nu_{\varepsilon,T} - \nu_\varepsilon$ can be quantified.

On the one hand, this will allow us to prove that ν_ε is a Cauchy sequence by controlling the difference $|\nu_{2\varepsilon} - \nu_\varepsilon|$ by the triangle inequality

$$|\nu_{2\varepsilon} - \nu_\varepsilon| \le |\nu_{2\varepsilon} - \nu_{2\varepsilon,T}| + |\nu_{2\varepsilon,T} - \nu_T| + |\nu_T - \nu_{\varepsilon,T}| + |\nu_{\varepsilon,T} - \nu_\varepsilon|, \tag{3.3}$$

and the estimates above for all $T > 0$, which we then optimize T (in function of ε). This yields the existence of ν and an estimate of $|\nu - \nu_\varepsilon|$. In the second step, we estimate $\nu - \nu_T$ as

$$|\nu - \nu_T| \le |\nu - \nu_\varepsilon| + |\nu_\varepsilon - \nu_{\varepsilon,T}| + |\nu_{\varepsilon,T} - \nu_T|, \tag{3.4}$$

use the estimates above for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and then optimize ε (in function of T) to obtain that $\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \nu_T = \nu$ (so that a posteriori, ν_T is bounded uniformly w.r.t. T). Since the limit of a quadratic form remains a quadratic form, ν has the desired structure (3.2).

We start with the approximation $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$ of ν_ε. This approximation relies on the standard massive approximation of the corrector and of its associated Richardson extrapolations first introduced in [15], and systematized in [17, 13].

Definition 3.1. For all $T > 0$, denote by ϕ_T the vector whose entries $\{\phi_{T,i}\}_{i=1,\ldots,d} : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ are the unique stationary solutions of the modified corrector equations

$$T^{-1}\phi_{T,i} - \nabla^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_i + \nabla\phi_{T,i}) \,=\, 0.$$

We define the Richardson extrapolations ϕ_T^κ of ϕ_T for all $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ by $\phi_T^1 \equiv \phi_T$, and the induction rule

$$\phi_T^{\kappa+1} \,:=\, \frac{1}{2^\kappa - 1}(2^\kappa \phi_{2T}^\kappa - \phi_T^\kappa).$$

□

This massive corrector ϕ_T and its extrapolations ϕ_T^κ are suitable approximations of the corrector ϕ in the following sense.

Lemma 3.2. *For all $\kappa > \frac{d}{4}$ we have for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi_T|^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_p 1, \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi_T^\kappa - \nabla\phi|^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_p T^{-\frac{d}{4}}. \tag{3.6}$$

□

Estimate (3.5) was first proved in [18], and estimate (3.6) is the p-version of [19, (2.19)]. It follows by integration of [19, Lemma 2.5], the main technical achievement of [19]. We are now in position to define the approximation $I_3^{\varepsilon,T}$ of I_3^ε, and then the approximation $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$ of ν_ε.

Definition 3.2. For all $d \geq 2$, let κ be the smallest integer larger than $\frac{d}{4}$. For all $T > 0$, we denote by ρ_T the $d \times d$-matrix-valued field given by the piecewise constant extension on $\mathbb{R}^d$ of

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Z}^d \ni z \mapsto \rho_T(z) \,:=\, &(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T^\kappa) \cdot \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T^\kappa)(z) \\ &- \nabla\phi_T^\kappa \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathrm{Id}(z) - \mathrm{Id} \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi_T^\kappa(z) - \boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T}\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T} := \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T^\kappa) \cdot \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T^\kappa)\right]$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $T > 0$, we then define $\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T} : C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{F} \,\mapsto\, \tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F}) := \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F}(x) : \rho_T(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})dx.$$

□

For all $T > 0$, the desired approximation $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$ of ν_ε is then given by

$$\nu_{\varepsilon,T} \,:=\, \mathrm{cov}\left[\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F}); \tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})\right].$$

In the following lemma, we show that $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$ has a limit as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Lemma 3.3. *For all $T>0$, we define the fourth-order tensor $\mathcal{Q}_T$ by*

$$\mathcal{Q}_T \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \operatorname{cov}\left[\rho_T(x);\rho_T(0)\right] dx,$$

where the integral is absolutely converging and the tensor is a priori bounded by $|\mathcal{Q}_T| \lesssim \log T$. The sequence $\{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ converges as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ to ν_T defined by

$$\nu_T \;:=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Q}_T : \mathcal{G},$$

and we have for all $\varepsilon>0$,

$$|\nu_T-\nu_{\varepsilon,T}| \;\lesssim\; (\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^2\left(\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right)^2. \tag{3.7}$$

For $\mathcal{F}=1_U\mathbf{e}_i\otimes\mathbf{e}_j$ and $\mathcal{G}=1_U\mathbf{e}_k\otimes\mathbf{e}_l$, where 1_U is the indicator function of some bounded set U (in which case, $\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F}),\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})$ are still well-defined), then

$$|\nu_T-\nu_{\varepsilon,T}| \;\lesssim\; |\partial U|\varepsilon\sqrt{T}. \tag{3.8}$$

□

We then quantify the approximation error $|\nu_\varepsilon-\nu_{\varepsilon,T}|$.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $T,\varepsilon>0$ with $1\ll\sqrt{T}\ll\varepsilon^{-1}$, we have for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$*

$$|\nu_\varepsilon-\nu_{\varepsilon,T}| \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \left(T^{-\frac{d}{4}}+\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\right)\sqrt{|\mathcal{Q}_T|+1}\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{3.9}$$

For $\mathcal{F}=1_U\mathbf{e}_i\otimes\mathbf{e}_j$ and $\mathcal{G}=1_U\mathbf{e}_k\otimes\mathbf{e}_l$ for some bounded set U, this estimate holds in the form

$$|\nu_\varepsilon-\nu_{\varepsilon,T}| \;\lesssim\; \left(T^{-\frac{d}{4}}+\varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\right)\sqrt{|\mathcal{Q}_T|+1}(|U|+|\partial U|). \tag{3.10}$$

□

The proof of Lemma 3.4 makes use of the flux corrector σ defined in (2.36), which essentially satisfies the same moment bounds as ϕ, as the following shows.

Lemma 3.5. *For all $p\ge 1$ and all $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\phi(z)|^p\right]^{\frac1p}+\mathbb{E}\left[|\sigma(z)|^p\right]^{\frac1p} \lesssim_p \begin{cases} \log^{\frac12}(2+|z|) & : \quad d=2,\\ 1 & : \quad d>2,\end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi(z)|^p\right]^{\frac1p}+\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\sigma(z)|^p\right]^{\frac1p} \lesssim_p 1.$$

□

Lemma 3.5 is the discrete version of [16, Theorem 3] (the latter yields in addition exponential moment bounds), the proof of which easily extends to the discrete setting considered here. The core of the proof of Lemma 3.4 are the following crucial estimates, which we state and prove in full generality for future reference.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $1 \le i,j \le d$. Given $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$, set $\eta_\varepsilon(x) := \eta(\varepsilon x)$ and $\chi_\varepsilon(x) := \chi(\varepsilon x)$. Then, for all $q > 2$ and $\alpha > 0$, we have for all $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_\varepsilon \phi_i \cdot (\nabla^* \cdot \sigma_j)\right] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \varepsilon^{-d}\big(\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2 \|(1+|\cdot|)^{1+\alpha} D\chi\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + \mu_d(\varepsilon)\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha \chi\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\big), \tag{3.11}$$

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta_\varepsilon \nabla\phi_i \cdot (\nabla^* \cdot \sigma_j)\right] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \mu_d(\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{2-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \tag{3.12}$$

In addition, for all $T, \varepsilon > 0$ with $1 \ll \sqrt{T} \ll \varepsilon^{-1}$,

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta_\varepsilon \nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa - \phi_i)\cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa - \phi_j)\right] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} T^{-\frac{d}{2}}\varepsilon^{-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha \eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2, \tag{3.13}$$

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_k^*(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa - \phi_i)\sigma_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_l \eta_\varepsilon\right] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \varepsilon^{-d}\big(T^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha \eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + \mu_d(\varepsilon)\varepsilon^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\big), \tag{3.14}$$

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_k(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa - \phi_i)\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon \mathbf{e}_k \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbf{e}_j\right] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \varepsilon^{2-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon \mathbf{e}_k \cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla_k(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa - \phi_i)(\mathbf{e}_j + \nabla\phi_j)\right] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \varepsilon^{2-d}\big(\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + T^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha \eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\big). \tag{3.16}$$

□

Before we prove Lemmas 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6, let us conclude the proof of Proposition 1. Estimates (3.7) and (3.9) together with $|\mathcal{Q}_T| \lesssim \log T$ (cf. Lemma 3.3) allow us to bound (3.3) for all $1 \ll \sqrt{T} \ll \varepsilon^{-1}$ by

$$|\nu_{2\varepsilon} - \nu_\varepsilon| \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \Big((\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^2 + \big(T^{-\frac{d}{4}} + \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\big)\sqrt{\log T + (\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^2 + 1}\Big) \times \big(\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\big)^2.$$

The choice $\sqrt{T} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{d+4}}$ then yields for $\varepsilon \ll 1$

$$|\nu_{2\varepsilon} - \nu_\varepsilon| \lesssim_{\alpha,q} |\log\varepsilon|^{\frac12}\Big(\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}} + \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\Big)\big(\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\big)^2.$$

This proves the existence of the limit $\nu = \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\nu_\varepsilon$, as well as the bound

$$|\nu_\varepsilon - \nu| \lesssim_{\alpha,q} |\log\varepsilon|^{\frac12}\Big(\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}} + \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\Big)\big(\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\big)^2. \tag{3.17}$$

Let us prove that ν has the desired structure of a quadratic form. To this end, we turn to (3.4) and obtain for all $1 \ll \sqrt{T} \ll \varepsilon^{-1}$

$$|\nu - \nu_T| \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \Big(|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac12}\big(\varepsilon^{\frac{2d}{d+4}} + \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\big) + \big(T^{-\frac{d}{4}} + \varepsilon\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\big)\sqrt{\log T + (\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^2 + 1}\Big) \times \big(\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\big)^2,$$

so that for the choice $\varepsilon = \sqrt{T}^{-\frac{d+4}{4}}$ we obtain

$$|\nu - \nu_T| \lesssim_{\alpha,q} (\log T)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(T^{-\frac{d}{4}} + T^{-\frac{d+4}{8}}\mu_d(T)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)\big(\|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{G}\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\big)^2.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{Q}$ exists as the limit of $\mathcal{Q}_T$, which is thus itself bounded. This also allows us to upgrade (3.17) to (2.32) (using the additional estimate $|\mathcal{Q}_T| \lesssim 1$ in (3.9)). The proof of (2.33) is similar upon choosing $\sqrt{T} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{d+2}}$.

The tensor $\mathcal{Q}$ is non-degenerate in the following sense:

Lemma 3.7. *If $\mathbb{P}$ is a nontrivial product measure, then there exists $\underline{\nu} > 0$, such that for all unit vectors $\mathbf{e}$,*

$$\mathbf{e}\otimes\mathbf{e} : \mathcal{Q} : \mathbf{e}\otimes\mathbf{e} \geq \underline{\nu}.$$

□

For future reference, we state a straightforward consequence of (3.17) and of the identity $\nu = \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \operatorname{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{F}$.

Corollary 3.1. *For all $\mathcal{F} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have for all $\alpha > 0$ and $q > 2$*

$$\operatorname{var}\Big[\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\Big] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \|\mathcal{F}\|^2_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

□

It thus remains to prove Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, and 3.7, which we do in the following four paragraphs. In the proofs we shall make crucial use of the following estimates first proved by Marahrens and the third author (see also [4, 14, 16, 3]):

Lemma 3.8. *For all $T \in (0, +\infty]$, the Green function $G_T : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, unique decaying solution for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ of*

$$T^{-1}G_T(\cdot, y) - \nabla^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla G_T(\cdot, y) = \delta(\cdot - y),$$

satisfies for some $c > 0$ and for all $p \geq 1$ the moment bounds: For all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla G_T(x,0)|^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_p \frac{1}{1+|x|^{d-1}}\exp(-c\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{T}}),$$
$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\nabla G_T(x,0)|^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_p \frac{1}{1+|x|^{d}}\exp(-c\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{T}}),$$

where $\nabla\nabla$ denotes the mixed second discrete gradient. □

3.2. **Proof of Lemma 2.1.** The starting point is the rewriting of ρ as Ξ plus an error term. Indeed, using (2.37) and (2.39)

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= (\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi) - \nabla\phi\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathrm{Id} - \mathrm{Id}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\nabla\phi - \boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\\ &= \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi) - \boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\nabla\phi + \nabla\phi\cdot(q - \boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}) - \boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\\ &= \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi) - \boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\nabla\phi - \boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}} + \nabla\phi\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma)\\ &= \Xi + \nabla\phi\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma).\end{aligned}$$

Appealing to (3.12) in Lemma 3.6, this yields for any $\mathcal{F} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d\times d}$

$$\|I_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}) - \tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\|^2_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})} \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \mu_d(\varepsilon)\varepsilon^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

as desired.

3.3. **Proof of Lemma 3.3.** We split the proof into three steps, first address the absolute convergence of the integral, and then prove (3.7) and (3.8).

Step 1. Definition of $\mathcal{Q}_T$.
Define $K_T : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d\times d\times d}$ as the piecewise constant extension of

$$\mathbb{Z}^d \ni x \mapsto K_T(x) := \operatorname{cov}\left[\rho_T(x);\rho_T(0)\right].$$

We claim that $K_T \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and shall define

$$\mathcal{Q}_T := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_T(x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} K_T(x)dx.$$

To prove the desired integrability, we appeal to the covariance estimate of Lemma 3.1, and thus need to compute the vertical derivative $\Delta_e\rho_T(x)$. Recall that

$$\rho_T(x) = (\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T^\kappa)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T^\kappa)(x) - \nabla\phi_T^\kappa\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathrm{Id}(x) - \mathrm{Id}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi_T^\kappa(x) - \boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T},$$

that ϕ_T^κ is the κ-th Richardson extrapolation of ϕ_T with respect to T, and that ϕ_T solves the massive approximation of the corrector equation

$$T^{-1}\phi_T - \nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{3.18}$$

By the discrete Leibniz rule, we have (denoting by ϕ_T^e and $\phi_T^{\kappa,e}$ the massive corrector and its extrapolation associated with $\boldsymbol{a}^e$)

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_e\rho_T(x) &= (\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T^\kappa)(x)\cdot\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(x)(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T^\kappa)(x)\\ &\quad+\Delta_e\nabla\phi_T^\kappa(x)\cdot\Big(\boldsymbol{a}^e(x)(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T^{\kappa,e})(x)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathrm{Id}\Big)\\ &\quad+\Big((\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T^\kappa)(x)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}^e(x)-\mathrm{Id}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\Big)\Delta_e\nabla\phi_T^\kappa(x)\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

For $e=(z,z+\mathbf{e}_i)$, $\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(x) = (a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z)\mathbf{e}_i\otimes\mathbf{e}_i$ (no summation on repeated indices). Taking the vertical derivative of (3.18) yields

$$T^{-1}\Delta_e\phi_T(x) - \nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(x)\Delta_e\phi_T(x) = \nabla^*\cdot\Big((a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z)\mathbf{e}_i\otimes\mathbf{e}_i(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T^e)(x)\Big). \tag{3.20}$$

By the Green representation formula followed by an integration by parts, this implies for all $1\le k\le d$,

$$\Delta_e\nabla\phi_{T,k}(x) = -(a^e(e)-a(e))\nabla\nabla_i G_T(x,z)\cdot(\delta_{ik}+\nabla_i\phi_{T,k}^e(z)). \tag{3.21}$$

Hence we have proved that for $\bar\rho_T(x) := (\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi_T)(x) - \nabla\phi_T\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathrm{Id}(x) - \mathrm{Id}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi_T(x)$,

$$|\Delta_e\bar\rho_T(x)| \lesssim (1+|\nabla\phi_T(z)|)^2\delta(x-z) + |\nabla\nabla G_T(x,z)|(1+|\nabla\phi_T(x)|+|\nabla\phi_T^e(x)|)^2, \tag{3.22}$$

and therefore with the moment bound $\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi_T^e|^8\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi_T|^8\right] \lesssim 1$ from Lemma 3.2 (using that ϕ_T^e and ϕ_T have the same law) and the estimate $\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\nabla G_T(x,z)|^4\right]^{\frac14} \lesssim \frac{1}{1+|x-z|^d}\exp(-c\frac{|x-z|}{\sqrt{T}})$ from Lemma 3.8,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\bar\rho_T(x)|^2\right]^{\frac12} \lesssim \frac{1}{1+|x-z|^d}\exp\Big(-c\frac{|x-z|}{\sqrt{T}}\Big).$$

This estimate still holds true for ρ_T (with a smaller constant $c>0$) since ϕ_T^κ is defined by extrapolation of ϕ_T. In particular, this yields

$$\begin{aligned}|K_T(x)| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\frac{1}{1+|x-z|^d}\exp\Big(-c\frac{|x-z|}{\sqrt{T}}\Big)\frac{1}{1+|z|^d}\exp\Big(-c\frac{|z|}{\sqrt{T}}\Big)dz\\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{1+|x|^d}\exp\Big(-c\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{T}}\Big),\end{aligned}\tag{3.23}$$

and finally

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|K_T(x)|dx\lesssim \log T,\tag{3.24}$$

as claimed.

Step 2. Proof of (3.7).
By the polarization formulas (that hold by symmetry)

$$\begin{aligned}2\int\mathcal{F}:\mathcal{Q}_T:\mathcal{G} &= \int(\mathcal{F}+\mathcal{G}):\mathcal{Q}_T:(\mathcal{F}+\mathcal{G})-\int\mathcal{F}:\mathcal{Q}_T:\mathcal{F}-\int\mathcal{G}:\mathcal{Q}_T:\mathcal{G},\\ 2\mathrm{cov}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F});\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})\right] &= \mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F}+\mathcal{G})\right]-\mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})\right]-\mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})\right],\end{aligned}$$

it is enough to prove the claim for $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{G}$. In this case we may appeal to the trivial identity

$$\begin{aligned}&-\frac12\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathcal{F}(x+y)-\mathcal{F}(x)):K_T(\frac{y}{\varepsilon}):(\mathcal{F}(x+y)-\mathcal{F}(x))dxdy\\ &\quad=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):K_T(\frac{y-x}{\varepsilon}):\mathcal{F}(y)dxdy-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):K_T(\frac{y}{\varepsilon}):\mathcal{F}(x)dxdy.\end{aligned}$$

By definition of ν_T, $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_T$, this turns into

$$\begin{aligned}|\nu_T-\nu_{\varepsilon,T}| &= \Big|\varepsilon^{-d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):K_T(\frac{x-y}{\varepsilon}):\mathcal{F}(y)dxdy-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):\mathcal{Q}_T:\mathcal{F}(x)dx\Big|\\ &= \frac12\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathcal{F}(x+\varepsilon z)-\mathcal{F}(x)):K_T(z):(\mathcal{F}(x+\varepsilon z)-\mathcal{F}(x))dzdx\Big|\\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\varepsilon z|^2|K_T(z)|dz.\end{aligned}$$

The desired estimate (3.7) then follows from (3.23)

Step 3. Proof of (3.8).

The starting point is the same identity as in Step 2: we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nu_T-\nu_{\varepsilon,T}| &= \Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1_U(x)\mathrm{Id}:K_T(z):(1_U(x-\varepsilon z)-1_U(x))\mathrm{Id}\,dzdx\Big|\\
&= \Big|\int_U\int_{x-\varepsilon z\notin U}\mathrm{Id}:K_T(z):\mathrm{Id}\,dzdx\Big|\\
&\lesssim \int_U\int_{x-\varepsilon z\notin U}\frac{1}{1+|z|^d}\exp\Big(-c\frac{|z|}{\sqrt{T}}\Big)dzdx\\
&\lesssim \int_U\int_{|z|\geq\frac{\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial U)}{\varepsilon}}\frac{1}{1+|z|^d}\exp\Big(-c\frac{|z|}{\sqrt{T}}\Big)dzdx\\
&\lesssim |\partial U|\int_0^\infty\int_{|z|\geq\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\frac{1}{1+|z|^d}\exp\Big(-c\frac{|z|}{\sqrt{T}}\Big)dzdt\\
&\lesssim |\partial U|\varepsilon\sqrt{T},
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

3.4. **Proof of Lemma 3.4.** In this section, we show that Lemma 3.6 implies Lemma 3.4, while the proof of Lemma 3.6 is postponed to the next subsection. We split the proof into three steps. We start with a reformulation in the first step which shows that the claim follows from two estimates, which we prove in the last two steps.

Step 1. Reformulation.
By definition of $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}$ and ν_ε,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{\varepsilon,T}-\nu_\varepsilon &= \mathrm{cov}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F});\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})\Big]-\mathrm{cov}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F});\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{G})\Big]\\
&= -\mathrm{cov}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F});\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{G})\Big]+\mathrm{cov}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F});\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})\Big]\\
&\quad+\mathrm{cov}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F});\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{G})\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nu_{\varepsilon,T}-\nu_\varepsilon| \leq\ & \mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})\Big]^{\frac12}\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{G})\Big]^{\frac12}\\
&+\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})\Big]^{\frac12}\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{G})\Big]^{\frac12}+\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{G})\Big]^{\frac12}\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})\Big]^{\frac12}.
\end{aligned}$$

The claim thus follows from the two estimates: for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$

$$\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})\Big]\lesssim(|\mathcal{Q}_T|+(\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^2)\|\mathcal{F}\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)},\tag{3.25}$$

$$\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})\Big]\lesssim_{\alpha,q} T^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^q}+\mu_d(\varepsilon)\varepsilon^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^q}.\tag{3.26}$$

The proof of (3.25) is similar to the proof of (3.7), and we only focus on the proof of (3.26).

Step 2. Proof of the identity: for all $1 \le m, n \le d$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{T,mn} - \rho_{mn} &= (\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,1} - \nabla\phi_1)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,2} - \nabla\phi_2) \\ &\quad - \nabla^*_j\big(\nabla^*_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,m} - \phi_m)\sigma_{njk}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k)\big) - \nabla^*_j\big(\nabla^*_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,n} - \phi_n)\sigma_{mjk}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k)\big) \\ &\quad - \nabla^*_i\big(\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,m} - \phi_m)\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_n\big) - \nabla^*_i\big(\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,n} - \phi_n)\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_m\big) \\ &\quad + \nabla^*_i\Big(\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\big(\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,m} - \phi_m)(\mathbf{e}_n + \nabla\phi_n) + \nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,n} - \phi_n)(\mathbf{e}_m + \nabla\phi_m)\big)\Big) \\ &\quad + (\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} - \boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T})_{mn},\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

the structure of which is best seen in its continuum version

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{T,mn} - \rho_{mn} &= D(\phi^\kappa_{T,1} - \phi_1)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}D(\phi^\kappa_{T,2} - \phi_2) \\ &\quad - D\cdot\big(\sigma_n\cdot D(\phi^\kappa_{T,m} - \phi_m)\big) - D\cdot\big(\sigma_m\cdot D(\phi^\kappa_{T,n} - \phi_n)\big) + (\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} - \boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T})_{mn}.\end{aligned}$$

The idea is to appeal to the corrector equation (2.4) for $\nabla\phi$ to reconstruct a square. Let $\chi : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ have compact support. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)(\rho_{T,mn}(z) - \rho_{mn}(z))dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)\Big((\mathbf{e}_m + \nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,m})\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n + \nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,n}) - (\mathbf{e}_m + \nabla\phi_m)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n + \nabla\phi_n)\Big)(z)dz \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)\mathbf{e}_m\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,n} - \phi_n)(z)dz - \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)\mathbf{e}_n\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,m} - \phi_m)(z)dz \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)(\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} - \boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T})_{mn}.\end{aligned}$$

We then complete the square in the first summand (and use symmetry)

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathbf{e}_m + \nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,m})\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n + \nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,n}) - (\mathbf{e}_m + \nabla\phi_m)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n + \nabla\phi_n) \\ &\qquad = \nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,m} - \phi_m)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,n} - \phi_n) + \nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,m} - \phi_m)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n + \nabla\phi_n) \\ &\qquad\qquad + \nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,n} - \phi_n)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_m + \nabla\phi_m),\end{aligned}$$

and appeal to the following discrete version of the Leibniz rule (summation on repeated indices) for all $\chi_1, \chi_2 : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\chi_1\nabla\chi_2 = \nabla(\chi_1\chi_2) - \mathbf{e}_i\chi_2(\cdot + \mathbf{e}_i)\nabla_i\chi_1 = \nabla(\chi_1\chi_2) - \chi_2\nabla\chi_1 - \mathbf{e}_i\nabla_i\chi_1\nabla_i\chi_2. \tag{3.28}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)\Big((\mathbf{e}_m+\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,m})\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n+\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,n})-(\mathbf{e}_m+\nabla\phi_m)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n+\nabla\phi_n)\Big)(z)dz\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)(\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\nabla\phi_m)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\nabla\phi_n)(z)dz\\
&+\underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla(\chi(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m))\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n+\nabla\phi_n)(z)dz}_{\overset{(2.4)}{=}0}+\underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla(\chi(\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\phi_n))\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_m+\nabla\phi_m)(z)dz}_{\overset{(2.4)}{=}0}\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)\nabla\chi\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n+\nabla\phi_n)(z)dz-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\phi_n)\nabla\chi\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_m+\nabla\phi_m)(z)dz\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_i\chi\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\Big(\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)(\mathbf{e}_n+\nabla\phi_n)+\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\phi_n)(\mathbf{e}_m+\nabla\phi_m)\Big)(z)dz.
\end{aligned}$$

We then recall the definition (2.36) of the flux corrector σ, and note that by (2.39), the skew-symmetry (2.38) of σ, and the discrete Leibniz rule (3.28) combined with the identity $\nabla^*_k g(z)=\nabla_k g(z-\mathbf{e}_k)$, we have for all $\zeta:\mathbb{Z}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ and $1\le i\le d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla\zeta\cdot\Big(\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_i\Big)&\overset{(2.39)}{=}\nabla\zeta\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_i)=\nabla_j\zeta\nabla^*_k\sigma_{ijk}\\
&=\nabla^*_k(\sigma_{ijk}(\cdot)\nabla_j\zeta(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k))-\underbrace{\sigma_{ijk}\nabla_k\nabla_j\zeta}_{\overset{(2.38)}{=}0}=\nabla_k(\sigma_{ijk}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\zeta(\cdot)),\quad(3.29)
\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently

$$\nabla\zeta\cdot\Big(\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_i\Big)=-\nabla\cdot(\sigma\cdot\nabla\zeta)-\nabla_k(\nabla^*_k\sigma_{ijk}\nabla_j\zeta),$$

which is closer to the continuum setting (the second RHS term is a "discretization error"). In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)\nabla\chi\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_n+\nabla\phi_n)(z)dz\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)\cdot\nabla\chi(z)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_n dz+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)\nabla_k(\sigma_{njk}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\chi)(z)dz\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)\nabla\chi(z)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_n dz-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla^*_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)(\sigma_{njk}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\chi)(z)dz\\
&\overset{(3.28)}{=}-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi\nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)(z)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_n dz-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)\nabla_i\chi(z)\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_n dz\\
&\quad-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla^*_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)(\sigma_{njk}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\chi)(z)dz.
\end{aligned}$$

The combination of these identities finally yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)(\rho_{T,mn}(z))-\rho_{mn}(z))dz \qquad (3.30)\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(z)(\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\nabla\phi_m)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\nabla\phi_n)(z)dz\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)\nabla_i\chi(z)\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_n dz+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\phi_n)\nabla_i\chi(z)\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_m dz\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla^*_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)(\sigma_{njk}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\chi)(z)dz+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla^*_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\phi_n)(\sigma_{mjk}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\chi)(z)dz\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_i\chi\mathbf{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\Big(\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,m}-\phi_m)(\mathbf{e}_n+\nabla\phi_n)+\nabla_i(\phi^\kappa_{T,n}-\phi_n)(\mathbf{e}_m+\nabla\phi_m)\Big)(z)dz\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi(\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}-\boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T})_{mn},
\end{aligned}$$

noting that the cross-terms of the type $\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon:\nabla(\phi^\kappa_{T,1}-\phi_1)(z)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_2dz$ exactly cancel (cf. remark on the small ellipticity ratio case after Theorem 1). This implies (3.27) by the arbitrariness of χ.

Step 3. Proof of (3.26).
By definition of $\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}$ and $\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}$,

$$\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})\Big]\;=\;\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}(x):\Big(\rho_T(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})-\rho(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})\Big)dx\right],$$

and hence, with the definition that $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon:=\mathcal{F}(\varepsilon\cdot)$,

$$\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})\Big]\;=\;\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x):(\rho_T(x)-\rho(x))dx\right].$$

Now inserting identity (3.30), applying (3.13), (3.14), (3.15) and (3.16) of Lemma 3.6 to estimate the variance of each term,we conclude for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough,

$$\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})\Big]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}T^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\mu_d(\varepsilon)\varepsilon^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

that is, (3.26).

Remark 3.1. For future reference, we also establish the following suboptimal decay: for all $\varepsilon,T>0$,

$$\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})\Big]\lesssim\Big(\varepsilon^2(\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^{-d}\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}+(\varepsilon T)^{-d}\Big)\|\mathcal{F}\|_{W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \qquad (3.31)$$

The starting point is identity (3.30) with $\chi=\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$, which by Hölder's inequality in probability and the observation that for all $z\in\mathbb{R}^d$

$$|\nabla\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(z)|\;=\;\Big|\fint_{z+Q}\big(\mathcal{F}(\varepsilon(x+\mathbf{e}_i))-\mathcal{F}(\varepsilon x)\big)dx\Big|\;\lesssim\;\varepsilon\int_{z+Q_2}|D\mathcal{F}(\varepsilon x)|dx, \qquad (3.32)$$

turns into

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}\Big[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\Big]&=\varepsilon^d\mathrm{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb R^d}\mathcal F_\varepsilon(x):(\rho_T(x)-\rho(x))dx\bigg]\\ \lesssim\varepsilon^{-d}\|\mathcal F\|_{L^1(\mathbb R^d)}^2\mathbb E\left[|\nabla(\phi_T^\kappa-\phi)|^4\right]&\\ +\varepsilon^{2-d}\Big\|\mathbb E\Big[|\sigma(\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})|^4+1\Big]^{\frac14}D\mathcal F\Big\|_{L^1(\mathbb R^d)}^2&\mathbb E\left[|\nabla(\phi_T^\kappa-\phi)|^4\right]^{\frac12}(1+\mathbb E\left[|\nabla\phi|^4\right]^{\frac12}).\end{aligned}$$

Combined with Lemmas 3.2 and 3.5 for $q=4$, this yields (3.31). □

3.5. **Proof of Lemma 3.6.** Let $1\le i,j\le d$, let $\eta\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb R^d)$ and $\chi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb R^d)^d$, and set $\eta_\varepsilon:=\eta(\varepsilon\cdot)$ and $\chi_\varepsilon:=\chi(\varepsilon\cdot)$. We split the proof into eight steps.

Step 1. Weighted Meyers' estimate: For all decaying u,u_T,g related via

$$-\nabla^*\cdot a\nabla u=\nabla\cdot g,\qquad \frac1T u_T-\nabla^*\cdot a\nabla u_T=\nabla\cdot g,$$

we have for all $|r-2|\ll1$, $|\alpha|\ll1$ and $|\beta|\ll1$

$$\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\beta}\nabla u\|_{L^r(\mathbb Z^d)}\lesssim\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\beta}g\|_{L^r(\mathbb Z^d)},\tag{3.33}$$

and for $1\ll\sqrt T\ll\varepsilon^{-1}$,

$$\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla u_T\|_{L^r(\mathbb Z^d)}\lesssim\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}g\|_{L^r(\mathbb Z^d)}\tag{3.34}$$

where $w_\varepsilon(x):=1+\varepsilon|x|$ and $w_1(x):=1+|x|$.
Such a weighted Meyers' estimate was first used in the context of homogenization in [8]. For the reader's convenience, we sketch a proof of this result. For simplicity we treat the continuum case. (The adaptation to the discrete setting requires to argue that the discrete Fourier symbols are controlled by their continuum counterparts introduced below, see for instance [18, Section 7.4] for similar arguments.)

We first argue in favor of (3.33). The starting point is the corresponding estimate for the constant-coefficient equation (i.e. for the Laplacian). Note that the weight $w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\beta}$ is of Muckenhoupt class A_1 (the strictest of these classes), meaning that its average over any ball is estimated by its infimum over the ball, as soon as $|\alpha+\beta|,|\beta|<d$ (cf. [39, Section V.1]). Hence, for the constant coefficient equation, the L^r-estimate with weight $w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\beta}$ holds for every $1<r<\infty$ (cf. [39, Corollary in Section V.4]), that is, we have a weighted Calderón-Zygmund estimate. Now Meyers' perturbation argument requires that the constant in this estimate converges to 1 as $r\to2$ and $|\alpha+\beta|,|\beta|\to0$. By a standard energy estimate, this constant equals one for $r=2$ and $\alpha=\beta=0$. The (upper semi-)continuity in r for fixed weight exponents α,β follows via complex interpolation (see e.g. [5, Theorem 4.4.1]) of $L^{q'}$-spaces (see e.g. [5, Theorem 5.1.1]). The continuity in the weight exponents $\alpha+\beta,\beta$ for fixed integrability exponent r follows from real interpolation (cf. the interpolation theorem of Stein and Weiss, see e.g. [5, Theorem 5.4.1]). Since both moduli of continuity are (locally) uniform (in fact, uniformly Lipschitz in the logarithmic scale), one so obtains joint continuity in integrability and weight exponents. This allows to then carry out Meyers' perturbation argument to pass from the constant to the variable-coefficient case and prove (3.33).

We now turn to (3.34). First we argue that Meyers' estimate is unaffected by the massive term $\frac1T\ge0$ and prove the unweighted version of (3.34). For the constant coefficient equation, the L^2-estimate for the Helmholtz projection is easily seen to be not affected by

the massive term. Now the L^p-estimate (or Calderón-Zygmund estimate) is not affected either: it follows from Mikhlin's multiplier theorem (see e.g. [5, Theorem 6.1.6]), noting that the Fourier symbol $\frac{k\otimes k}{\frac{1}{T}+|k|^2}$ has just the same derivative bounds as $\frac{k\otimes k}{|k|^2}$. This yields (3.34) with $\alpha=0$ by Meyers' perturbative argument.

We now turn to the weighted version (3.34) in our regime of interest $1\ll\sqrt{T}\ll\varepsilon^{-1}$. In that regime, we show that the weight can always be smuggled in (even for large $|\alpha|$). For that purpose, let us consider the solution v_T to

$$\frac{1}{T}v_T-\triangle v_T=\frac{1}{T}f+D\cdot g.$$

First, the energy estimate takes the form

$$\Big\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}v_T\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|Dv_T\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}\le\Big\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}f\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|g\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Second, the Fourier symbol relating $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}f,g)$ to $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}u,Du)$ is given by

$$M(k):=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{T}\frac{1}{\frac{1}{T}+|k|^2} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\frac{k'}{\frac{1}{T}+|k|^2}\\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\frac{k}{\frac{1}{T}+|k|^2} & \frac{k\otimes k}{\frac{1}{T}+|k|^2}\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{1+|\sqrt{T}k|^2} & \frac{\sqrt{T}k'}{1+|\sqrt{T}k|^2}\\ \frac{\sqrt{T}k}{1+|\sqrt{T}k|^2} & \frac{\sqrt{T}k\otimes\sqrt{T}k}{1+|\sqrt{T}k|^2}\end{pmatrix}=\hat{M}(\sqrt{T}k).$$

We note that M is well-behaved: we have $|D^m\hat{M}(\hat{k})|\lesssim_m(1+|\hat{k}|)^{-m}$, and thus $|D^mM(k)|\lesssim_m|k|^{-m}$ for all $m\ge0$. An extended Calderón-Zygmund estimate then follows by Mikhlin's multiplier theorem: for all $1<r<\infty$,

$$\Big\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}v_T\Big\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|Dv_T\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}\lesssim_r\Big\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}f\Big\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|g\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Now Meyers' perturbation argument may be applied to this extended setting. Finally, this extended Meyers' estimate allows to deal directly with the Leibniz terms when smuggling in the weight $w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$, using the estimate $\sqrt{T}|Dw_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}|\ll\varepsilon^{-1}|Dw_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}|\lesssim_\alpha w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ to absorb these Leibniz terms into the LHS. This proves (3.34).

Step 2. Proof of (3.12).
The variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 yields

$$\operatorname{var}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\Big]\lesssim\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\Delta_e\big(\nabla\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\big)\Big|^2\Big].$$

Integrating by parts, using the discrete Leibniz rule (3.28), and the skew-symmetry of σ_j, the argument of the expectation turns into

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\Delta_e\big(\nabla\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\nabla\Delta_e\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_i^e\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j)\\&=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\nabla\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_i^e\nabla_k^*\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot((\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)).\end{aligned}$$

By the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}^e)$ (so that $\phi_i^e((\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k))$ and $-\phi_i((\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k))$ have the same law), and using (2.39) in the form $\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j=\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\bigg]&\lesssim\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\nabla\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\bigg|^2\bigg]\\&+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_i\nabla_k^*\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\bigg|^2\bigg].\end{aligned}\tag{3.35}$$

We estimate the two sums in the RHS by duality. Let $(\omega_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\in\ell^2(\mathbb{B})$ be momentarily fixed, and define the weight $w_\varepsilon(x)=1+\varepsilon|x|$, $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$. Appealing to Hölder's inequality with exponents $0<q-2\ll1$ and $0<2-q'\ll1$ related by $\frac1q+\frac1{q'}=1$, and smuggling in a small power $0<\alpha\ll1$ of the weight w_ε, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\bigg|\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\nabla\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\bigg|+\bigg|\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_i\nabla_k^*\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\bigg|\\&\lesssim\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha|\sigma_j|\nabla\eta_\varepsilon|\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\&\qquad+\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha|\phi_i|\nabla\eta_\varepsilon|\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.36}$$

Taking vertical derivatives of the corrector equation (2.4) and summing over $e\in\mathbb{B}$ yield

$$-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i=\nabla\cdot\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_i^e+\mathbf{e}_i).\tag{3.37}$$

Since $|\alpha|\ll1$ and $|q'-2|\ll1$, we have by the weighted Meyers estimate (3.33)

$$\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\lesssim\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_i^e+\mathbf{e}_i)\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)},\tag{3.38}$$

Likewise, since (2.39) implies $\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))=\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\Delta_e\phi_j+\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j^e+\mathbf{e}_j)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}&\lesssim\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\Delta_e\phi_j\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\\&+\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j^e+\mathbf{e}_j)\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}.\end{aligned}$$

For $e\in\mathbb{B}$ we use the notation $e=(z_e,z_e+\mathbf{e}_e)$. Since $\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(x)=(a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z_e)\mathbf{e}_e\otimes\mathbf{e}_e$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}+\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\\&\lesssim\bigg(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}|\omega_e|^{q'}|w_\varepsilon(z_e)|^{-\alpha q'}(1+|\nabla\phi^e(z_e)|^{q'})\bigg)^{\frac1{q'}},\end{aligned}$$

and hence, by Hölder's inequality with exponents $(\frac{2}{q'}, \frac{2}{2-q'})$, we have for $1 \ll p < \infty$ given by $\frac{1}{q'} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}$,

$$\left\| w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \nabla \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \omega_e \Delta_e \phi_i \right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)} + \left\| w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \omega_e \Delta_e (\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla \phi_j + \mathbf{e}_j)) \right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}$$
$$\lesssim \left(\sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} |\omega_e|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} |w_\varepsilon(z_e)|^{-\alpha p} (1 + |\nabla \phi^e(z_e)|^p) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (3.39)$$

Inserting this estimate into (3.36), and taking the supremum over all $(\omega_e)_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{B})$, we obtain by duality

$$S_\varepsilon := \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_k \eta_\varepsilon \nabla \Delta_e \phi_i(\cdot + \mathbf{e}_k) \cdot \sigma_j \cdot \mathbf{e}_k \right|^2 + \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_i \nabla_k^* \eta_\varepsilon \mathbf{e}_k \cdot \Delta_e (\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla \phi_j + \mathbf{e}_j))(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \right|^2$$
$$\lesssim \left(\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha |\sigma_j| \nabla \eta_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + \|w_\varepsilon^\alpha |\phi_i| \nabla \eta_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} |w_\varepsilon(z_e)|^{-\alpha p} (1 + |\nabla \phi^e(z_e)|^p) \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}. \quad (3.40)$$

Taking the expectation of (3.40), using Hölder's and Young's inequalities, and appealing to Lemma 3.5 in the forms $\mathbb{E}\left[|\sigma_j(x)|^q\right]^{\frac{1}{q}} + \mathbb{E}\left[|\phi_i(x)|^q\right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim_q \mu_d(2 + |x|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla \phi^e|^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_q 1$, we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}\left[S_\varepsilon\right] \lesssim_q \|w_\varepsilon^\alpha \mu_d(2 + |\cdot|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \eta_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{Z}^d)}^2.$$

Recall that $\alpha > 0$ and $q > 2$ are chosen in the range of validity of (3.33). We possibly further reduce $q > 2$ in such a way that $\alpha p = \frac{2\alpha q}{q-2} > d$, in which case the second factor $\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{Z}^d)}^2$ is finite. By the observation (3.32), we then obtain after rescaling the spatial integrals

$$\mathbb{E}\left[S_\varepsilon\right] \lesssim_{\alpha,q} \varepsilon^{2-d} \mu_d(\varepsilon) \|(1 + |\cdot|)^\alpha \mu_d(2 + |\cdot|)^{\frac{1}{2}} D\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

The claim (3.12) follows from this estimate, (3.40), and (3.35).

Step 3. Proof of (3.13).
By the variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 and the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{a}^e)$ as in Step 2, we have

$$\operatorname{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta_\varepsilon \nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa - \phi_i) \cdot \boldsymbol{a} \nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa - \phi_j) \right]$$
$$\lesssim \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta_\varepsilon \nabla \Delta_e(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa - \phi_i) \cdot \boldsymbol{a} \nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa - \phi_j) \right|^2 \right]$$
$$+ \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta_\varepsilon \nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa - \phi_i) \cdot \Delta_e\big(\boldsymbol{a} \nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa - \phi_j)\big) \right|^2 \right],$$

which we further bound by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa-\phi_j)\bigg] \qquad (3.41)\\
&\lesssim \underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\Delta_e\nabla\phi_i\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa-\phi_j)\Big|^2\bigg]}_{=:\,S_1^\varepsilon}\\
&\quad+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)\cdot\Delta_e\big(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j)\big)\Big|^2\bigg]}_{=:\,S_2^\varepsilon}\\
&\quad+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\Delta_e\nabla\phi_{T,i}^\kappa\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa-\phi_j)\Big|^2\bigg]}_{=:\,S_3^\varepsilon}\\
&\quad+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)\cdot\Delta_e\big(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_{T,j}^\kappa+\mathbf{e}_j)\big)\Big|^2\bigg]}_{=:\,S_4^\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote by S_1^ε, S_2^ε, S_3^ε and S_4^ε the four RHS sums. Since $S_1^\varepsilon+S_2^\varepsilon$ coincides with the LHS of (3.40) with $(\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)$ and $(\phi_i\nabla_k^*\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k)(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)$ replaced by $\eta_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa-\phi_j)$ and $\eta_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)$, respectively, the duality argument that leads to (3.40) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1^\varepsilon+S_2^\varepsilon\lesssim\mathbb{E}\bigg[&\big(\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha\eta_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi_{T,j}^\kappa-\phi_j)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2+\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha\eta_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\big)\\
&\times\bigg(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}|w_\varepsilon(z_e)|^{-\alpha p}(1+|\nabla\phi^e(z_e)|^p)\bigg)^{\frac{2}{p}}\bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.2 in form of $\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla(\phi_T^\kappa-\phi)|^q\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\lesssim_q T^{-\frac{d}{4}}$, and arguing as in Step 2, we obtain for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough

$$S_1^\varepsilon+S_2^\varepsilon\lesssim_{\alpha,q}T^{-\frac{d}{2}}\varepsilon^{-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \qquad (3.42)$$

We turn now to S_3^ε and S_4^ε. The only difference with S_1^ε and S_2^ε is that $\Delta_e\nabla\phi_i$ and $\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\phi_j)$ are replaced by their Richardson extrapolations $\Delta_e\nabla\phi_{T,i}^\kappa$ and $\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\phi_{T,j}^\kappa)$, respectively. We then argue for $S_3^\varepsilon+S_4^\varepsilon$ as for $S_1^\varepsilon+S_2^\varepsilon$. By Lemma 3.2, $\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi_T^{\kappa,e}|^p\right]\lesssim_q 1$, and it suffices to adapt the Meyers argument that leads to (3.38). Taking vertical derivatives of the massive corrector equation (3.18) and summing over $e\in\mathbb{B}$ yield

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_{T,i}-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_{T,i}=\nabla\cdot\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_{T,i}^e+\mathbf{e}_i).$$

By the Meyers weighted estimate (3.34) in the regime $1 \ll \sqrt{T} \ll \varepsilon^{-1}$ (cf. Step 1), we infer that for all $|\alpha| \ll 1$ and $|q'-2| \ll 1$,

$$\left\| w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \nabla \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \Delta_e \phi_{T,i} \right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \lesssim \left\| w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \Delta_e \boldsymbol{a}(\nabla \phi^e_{T,i} + \mathbf{e}_i) \right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)},$$

and hence for the Richardson extrapolation

$$\left\| w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \nabla \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \Delta_e \phi^\kappa_{T,i} \right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)} \lesssim \sum_{s=0}^{\kappa-1} \left\| w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \Delta_e \boldsymbol{a}(\nabla \phi^e_{2^s T,i} + \mathbf{e}_i) \right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}.$$

Arguing as above for $S_1^\varepsilon + S_2^\varepsilon$, we then conclude that for all $\alpha > 0$ and $q > 2$ small enough,

$$S_3^\varepsilon + S_4^\varepsilon \lesssim_{\alpha,q} T^{-\frac{d}{2}} \varepsilon^{-d} \|(1 + |\cdot|)^\alpha \eta\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

so that the claim (3.13) follows from (3.42) and (3.41).

Step 4. Proof of (3.14).
The variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_k^*(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \sigma_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \nabla_l \eta_\varepsilon \right] \\ &\qquad\qquad \lesssim \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta_e\big(\nabla_k^*(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \sigma_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \nabla_l \eta_\varepsilon \big) \right|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts, and using the discrete Leibniz rule (3.28) and the skew-symmetry of σ_j, the argument of the expectation turns into

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \nabla_k^* \Delta_e(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \sigma^e_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \nabla_l \eta_\varepsilon + \int \nabla_k^*(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \Delta_e \sigma_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \nabla_l \eta_\varepsilon \\ &= \int \nabla_k^* \Delta_e(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \sigma^e_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \nabla_l \eta_\varepsilon - \int \eta_\varepsilon \nabla_k^*(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \nabla_l^* \Delta_e \sigma_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \\ &\qquad - \underbrace{\int \eta_\varepsilon \Delta_e \sigma_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_l) \nabla_l^* \nabla_k^*(\phi_{T,i} - \phi_i)}_{=0} \\ &= \int \nabla_k^* \Delta_e(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \sigma^e_{jkl}(\cdot - \mathbf{e}_k) \nabla_l \eta_\varepsilon - \int \eta_\varepsilon(\cdot + \mathbf{e}_k) \nabla_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,i} - \phi_i) \nabla_l^* \Delta_e \sigma_{jkl}. \end{aligned}$$

By the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}^e)$, and using (2.39) in the form $\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j=\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))$, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k^*(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)\sigma_{jkl}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_l\eta_\varepsilon\bigg]\\
&\lesssim\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k^*\Delta_e\phi_i\sigma_{jkl}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_l\eta_\varepsilon\Big|^2\bigg]}_{=:T_1^\varepsilon}+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k^*\Delta_e\phi_{T,i}^\kappa\sigma_{jkl}(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_l\eta_\varepsilon\Big|^2\bigg]}_{=:T_2^\varepsilon}\\
&\qquad+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\eta_\varepsilon(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))\Big|^2\bigg]}_{=:T_3^\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote by T_1^ε, T_2^ε and T_3^ε the three RHS sums. The first term T_1^ε coincides with the first RHS term of (3.35) (up to a translation in the test function) so that by Step 2 we have for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough

$$T_1^\varepsilon\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^{2-d}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\tag{3.43}$$

Likewise, the third term T_3^ε coincides with S_2^ε in Step 3 (up to a translation in the test function), so that

$$T_3^\varepsilon\lesssim_{\alpha,q}T^{-\frac{d}{2}}\varepsilon^{-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\tag{3.44}$$

The second term T_2^ε is similar to T_1^ε, with however $\nabla\Delta_e\phi_i$ replaced by its Richardson extrapolation $\nabla\Delta_e\phi_{T,i}^\kappa$. Adapting the argument of Step 2 to the Richardson extrapolation (as detailed in Step 3), we then obtain

$$T_2^\varepsilon\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^{2-d}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\eta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{Z}^d)}^2.\tag{3.45}$$

Together with (3.43) and (3.44), this yields the result (3.14).

Step 5. Proof of the higher order estimates (3.15) and (3.16).
We start with (3.15). The variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k(\phi_{T,i}^\kappa-\phi_i)\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_j\bigg]\\
&\qquad\lesssim\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_i\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_j\Big|^2\bigg]\\
&\qquad\qquad+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_{T,i}^\kappa\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_j\Big|^2\bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

The two RHS terms are similar to the terms T_1^ε and T_2^ε in Step 4 (however without the factor σ , so that there is no logarithmic correction in dimension $d=2$), and (3.15) follows. We turn to (3.16). The variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 and the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}^e)$

yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,i}-\phi_i)(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\right]\\
&\lesssim\ \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_i(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\right|^2\right]\\
&\quad+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi^\kappa_{T,i}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\right|^2\right]\\
&\quad+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon\mathbf{e}_k\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla_k(\phi^\kappa_{T,i}-\phi_i)\nabla\Delta_e\phi_j\right|^2\right].
\end{aligned}$$

The first two RHS terms are similar to the terms T_1^ε and T_2^ε in Step 4 (with however σ replaced by $\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j$, so that there is no logarithmic correction in dimension $d=2$), while the last RHS term is similar to the term S_1^ε in Step 3 (with however η_ε replaced by $\nabla\eta_\varepsilon$), and (3.16) follows.

Step 6. Proof of (3.11) for $d>2$.
The variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 yields

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\right]\lesssim\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\Delta_e(\phi_i\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\right|^2\right].$$

Integrating by parts and using the discrete Leibniz rule (3.28) turn the argument of the expectation into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\Delta_e(\phi_i\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\phi_i^e(\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\Delta_e\phi_i(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\phi_i^e(\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\nabla\Delta_e\phi_i-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k.
\end{aligned}$$

By the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}^e)$, and using (2.39) in the form $\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\sigma_j=\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\right]\lesssim\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\nabla\Delta_e\phi_i\right|^2\right]\\
&+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\phi_i\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_j+\mathbf{e}_j))\right|^2\right]+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\right|^2\right].
\end{aligned}$$

The first two RHS terms are similar to the RHS of (3.35) (with however $(\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\eta_\varepsilon)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)$ and $(\phi_i\nabla_k^*\eta_\varepsilon)(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)$ replaced by $\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j$ and $\phi_i\chi_\varepsilon$, respectively). A direct adaptation of Step 2 then yields for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\phi_i\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\right]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^{-d}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha\chi\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
&\qquad\qquad+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\right|^2\right]. \quad (3.46)
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate the last RHS term above. In this step, we focus on the case $d>2$, and argue once more by duality. Let $(\omega_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\in\ell^2(\mathbb{B})$ be momentarily fixed. Appealing to Hölder's inequality with exponents $0<q-2\ll 1$ and $0<2-q'\ll 1$ related by $\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{q'}=1$, smuggling in the weight $w_1(x)=1+|x|$ as well as a small power $0<\alpha\ll 1$ of the weight $w_\varepsilon(x)=1+\varepsilon|x|$, we obtain

$$\Big|\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\Big| \\ \lesssim \|w_1w_\varepsilon^\alpha|\sigma|\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big\|w_1^{-1}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}. \quad (3.47)$$

By Hardy's (discrete) inequality, the (discrete) Leibniz formula, and the elementary estimate

$$|\nabla w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}|\lesssim\alpha w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha-1}|\nabla w_\varepsilon|\lesssim\alpha w_1^{-1}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha},$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|w_1^{-1}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\\ \le\;& C_q\Big\|\nabla\Big(w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big)\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\\ \le\;&\alpha C_q\Big\|w_1^{-1}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}+C_q\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since for $d>2$ the exponent $q'\sim 2$ in Hardy's inequality is not critical, Hardy's constant C_q is uniformly bounded and thus $\alpha C_q\ll 1$, so that the first RHS term may be absorbed in the LHS, which yields:

$$\Big\|w_1^{-1}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\lesssim_q\Big\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}. \quad (3.48)$$

By (3.39) in Step 2, we then deduce for $1\ll p=\frac{2q}{q-2}<\infty$ (so that $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{2}$),

$$\Big\|w_1^{-1}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\lesssim\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}|\omega_e|^2\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}|w_\varepsilon(z_e)|^{-\alpha p}(1+|\nabla\phi^e(z_e)|^p)\Big)^{\frac1p}. \quad (3.49)$$

Inserting this into (3.47) and taking the supremum over $(\omega_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$ then yields by duality

$$T_\varepsilon:=\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\Big|^2 \\ \lesssim\|w_1w_\varepsilon^\alpha|\sigma_j|\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}|w_\varepsilon(z_e)|^{-\alpha p}(1+|\nabla\phi^e(z_e)|^p)\Big)^{\frac2p}.$$

Taking the expectation of both sides, using Hölder's and Young's inequalities, and applying Lemma 3.5 (for $d>2$) in the form $\mathbb{E}\,[|\sigma_j(x)|^q]^{\frac1q}+\mathbb{E}\,[|\nabla\phi^e|^p]^{\frac1p}\lesssim_q 1$, we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}\,[T_\varepsilon]\lesssim_q\|w_1w_\varepsilon^\alpha\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{Z}^d)}^2.$$

We then choose p so large (that is, $q>2$ small enough) that $\alpha p>d$, in which case $\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\|_{L^p}\lesssim\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{p}}$. A rescaling in the spatial integrals then yields, using that $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T_\varepsilon\right]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^{-d}\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D\chi\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

The claim (3.11) (for $d>2$) then follows from this together with (3.46). To deal with the case $d=2$, we need a critical Sobolev estimate. We state and prove this estimate in Step 7 and then turn to the proof of (3.11) for $d=2$ in Step 8.

Step 7. Critical Sobolev estimate.
Denote by $A_n:=\{x\in\mathbb{Z}^2:2^{n-1}\le|x|<2^n\}$ dyadic annuli for all $n\ge1$ and set $A_0:=B_1$. In this step, we prove the following critical Sobolev estimate in dimension $d=2$: for all $\frac{1}{p}=\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{q'}-\frac{1}{2}$, and all compactly supported $\zeta:\mathbb{Z}^2\to\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\sup_{n\ge0}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}(\zeta-\zeta(0))\|_{L^p(A_n)}\lesssim|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{q}}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}.\tag{3.50}$$

Wlog we may assume $\zeta(0)=0$. For all n, set $\zeta_n:=\fint_{A_n}\zeta$. As p is the Sobolev exponent for q', the following Poincaré-Sobolev inequality holds uniformly wrt n:

$$\|\zeta-\zeta_n\|_{L^p(A_n\cup A_{n+1})}\lesssim_q\|\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(A_n\cup A_{n+1})}$$

(note that we substract the average on A_n for the estimate on $A_n\cup A_{n+1}$). Smuggling the weight function $w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}$ then yields

$$\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}(\zeta-\zeta_n)\|_{L^p(A_n\cup A_{n+1})}\lesssim\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(A_n\cup A_{n+1})}.\tag{3.51}$$

By criticality of the weight $w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}$ we have $\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\zeta_n\|_{L^p(A_n\cup A_{n+1})}\sim(\varepsilon2^n+1)^{-\alpha}|\zeta_n|$, so that for (3.50) it is enough to estimate the dyadic averages as follows

$$(\varepsilon2^n+1)^{-\alpha}|\zeta_n|\lesssim|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{q}}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}.\tag{3.52}$$

For this, we note that, because of the criticality of the weight $w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}$, (3.51) implies by Jensen's inequality

$$(\varepsilon2^n+1)^{-\alpha}|\zeta_{n+1}-\zeta_n|\lesssim\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(A_n\cup A_{n+1})}.$$

By our assumption $\zeta(0)=0$,

$$|\zeta_0|\lesssim\|\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(B_1)}\lesssim\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(B_1)},$$

and we obtain

$$|\zeta_N|\lesssim\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(A_0)}+\sum_{n=1}^{N-1}(\varepsilon2^n+1)^{\alpha}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(A_n)},$$

and thus by Hölder's inequality in n,

$$|\zeta_N|\lesssim\left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}(\varepsilon2^n+1)^{\alpha q}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}\nabla\zeta\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}.$$

Thanks to $\alpha>0$ this yields the claim (3.52), and the result (3.50) follows.

Step 8. Proof of (3.11) for $d=2$.

As for $d>2$, we proceed by duality with the exponents $1\ll p<\infty$ and $0<q-2\ll 1$ related by $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{2}$. The argument involves the expression $\|w\nabla\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi\|_p$ for a suitable weight w. On top of the super-critical weight $(1+|x|)^{-\frac{2}{p}-\alpha}$ for some $0<\alpha\ll 1$ already used for $d>2$ to deal with the far-field $|x|\gg\varepsilon^{-1}$ contribution, we need the critical weight $(1+|x|)^{-\frac{2}{p}}$ for the intermediate range $1\lesssim|x|\lesssim\varepsilon^{-1}$. As typical for critical scalings, it is convenient to work with the dyadic annuli A_n.

Since (3.46) in Step 6 also holds for $d=2$, it is enough to prove for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough

$$\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg|\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\bigg|^2\bigg]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^{-2}|\log\varepsilon|^2\|w_1^{1+3\alpha}\nabla\chi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2.\tag{3.53}$$

We argue again by duality. Let $(\omega_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\in\ell^2(\mathbb{B})$ be momentarily fixed. By Hölder's inequality with exponents 2, $0<q-2\ll 1$ and $1\ll p<\infty$ related by $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{2}$, smuggling in the critical weight $w_1^{\frac{2}{p}}$ and a small power $0<\alpha\ll 1$ of the weight w_ε, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}U_\varepsilon&:=\bigg|\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\bigg|\\&\le\sum_{n=0}^\infty\bigg|\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\int_{A_n}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\bigg|\\&\lesssim\sum_{n=0}^\infty\|w_1^{\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{q}+2\alpha}\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(A_n)}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{q}-\alpha}\sigma\|_{L^q(A_n)}\Big\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^p(A_n)},\end{aligned}$$

where we used the notation A_n both for the continuum and discrete annuli. By Hölder's inequality for the sum over n with exponents q, $0<2-q'\ll 1$, and ∞, related by $\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{q'}=1$, this turns into

$$\begin{aligned}U_\varepsilon\lesssim\bigg(\sum_{n=0}^\infty\|w_1^{\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{q}+2\alpha}\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(A_n)}^{q'}\bigg)^{\frac{1}{q'}}&\\\times\|w_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{q}-\alpha}\sigma\|_{L^q(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\sup_{n\ge0}\Big\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^p(A_n)}.&\end{aligned}\tag{3.54}$$

To lighten the expression, we simplify the first factor using

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{p}}\|w_1^{\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{q}+2\alpha}\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(A_n)}&\le\begin{cases}\varepsilon^\alpha(1+2^n)^\alpha\|w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{q}+2\alpha}(\varepsilon w_1)^{\frac{2}{p}-\alpha}\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(A_n)}\\\varepsilon^{-\alpha}(1+2^{n-1})^{-\alpha}\|w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{q}+2\alpha}(\varepsilon w_1)^{\frac{2}{p}+\alpha}\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(A_n)}\end{cases}\\&\lesssim\min\{\varepsilon2^n,(\varepsilon2^n)^{-1}\}^\alpha\|w_\varepsilon^{1+3\alpha}\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)},\end{aligned}\tag{3.55}$$

where we used $\frac{2}{p}+\frac{2}{q}=1$, $\varepsilon w_1\le w_\varepsilon$, and assumed wlog that $\alpha<\frac{2}{p}$. By rescaling the integral $\|w_\varepsilon^{1+3\alpha}\nabla\chi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\le\|w_1^{1+3\alpha}D\chi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ and noting the geometric series sums to ~1, (3.54) then takes the form

$$U_\varepsilon\lesssim_\alpha\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{p}}\|w_1^{1+3\alpha}D\chi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{q}-\alpha}\sigma\|_{L^q(\mathbb{Z}^d)}\sup_{n\ge0}\Big\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\Big\|_{L^p(A_n)}.$$

We appeal to (3.50) to estimate the last factor (recalling that $\Delta_e\phi_i(0)=0$ by our choice of the anchoring $\phi(0)=0$), and obtain

$$U_\varepsilon \lesssim_\alpha \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{p}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{q}}\|w_1^{1+3\alpha}D\chi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{q}-\alpha}\sigma\|_{L^q(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\left\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}. \tag{3.56}$$

The rest of the proof is then the same as for $d>2$ in Step 6. By the Meyers estimate (3.33) with weight $w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}r^{-\frac{2}{p}}$ applied to equation (3.37), which we may apply since $|\alpha|,|\frac{2}{p}|,|q'-2|\ll 1$, we have

$$\left\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\lesssim\left\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_i^e+\mathbf{e}_i)\right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}.$$

Since $\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(x)=(a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z_e)\mathbf{e}_e\otimes\mathbf{e}_e$, we obtain

$$\left\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\lesssim\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}|\omega_e|^{q'}w_1(z_e)^{-\frac{2q'}{p}}w_\varepsilon(z_e)^{-\alpha q'}(1+|\nabla\phi_i^e(z_e)|^{q'})\Big)^{\frac{1}{q'}},$$

and hence by Hölder's inequality

$$\left\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_i\right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\lesssim\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}|\omega_e|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}w_1(z_e)^{-2}w_\varepsilon(z_e)^{-\alpha p}(1+|\nabla\phi_i^e(z_e)|^p)\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{3.57}$$

Inserting this estimate into (3.56), and taking the supremum over all $(\omega_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\in\ell^2(\mathbb{B})$, we obtain by duality

$$\begin{aligned}V_\varepsilon &:= \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\Delta_e\phi_i(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\chi_\varepsilon\cdot\sigma_j\cdot\mathbf{e}_k\Big|^2\\ &\lesssim_\alpha \varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{p}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{2}{q}}\|w_1^{1+3\alpha}D\chi\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{q}-\alpha}\sigma\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\\ &\qquad\times\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}w_1(z_e)^{-2}w_\varepsilon(z_e)^{-\alpha p}(1+|\nabla\phi_i^e(z_e)|^p)\Big)^{\frac{2}{p}}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation of this inequality, using Hölder's and Young's inequalities, and applying Lemma 3.5 in the forms $\mathbb{E}\,[|\sigma_j(x)|^q]^{\frac{1}{q}}\lesssim_q\log^{\frac{1}{2}}(2+|x|)$ and $\mathbb{E}\,[|\nabla\phi^e|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}}\lesssim_q 1$, we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}\,[V_\varepsilon]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{p}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{2}{q}}\|w_1^{1+3\alpha}D\chi\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|w_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{q}-\alpha}\log^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+w_1)\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\|^2_{L^p(\mathbb{Z}^2)}.$$

Direct calculations yield

$$\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{p}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\|^2_{L^p(\mathbb{Z}^2)}\lesssim\Big(\int_{|z|\le\varepsilon^{-1}}|z|^{-2}dz+\varepsilon^{-\alpha p}\int_{|z|\ge\varepsilon^{-1}}|z|^{-2-\alpha p}dz\Big)^{\frac{2}{p}}\lesssim_\alpha|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{2}{p}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|w_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{q}-\alpha}\log^{\frac12}(1+w_1)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{Z}^2)}^2\\
\lesssim\;&\Big(\int_{|z|\le\varepsilon^{-1}}\log(2+|z|)^{\frac{q}{2}}dz+\varepsilon^{-2-\alpha q}\int_{|z|\ge\varepsilon^{-1}}|z|^{-2-\alpha q}\log(|z|)^{\frac{q}{2}}\Big)^{\frac{2}{q}}\\
\lesssim\;&\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{q}}|\log\varepsilon|,
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[V_\varepsilon\right]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^{-2}|\log\varepsilon|^2\|w_1^{1+3\alpha}D\chi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2,$$

that is, (3.53). The claim (3.11) for $d=2$ follows.

3.6. **Proof of Lemma 3.7.** This proof is a variant of the proof of [19, Proposition 2.1]. It is inspired by [41]. The starting point is the following lower bound that holds for all $X\in L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$ since $\mathbb{P}$ is a product measure (cf. e.g. [42, Proposition 3.1]):

$$\operatorname{var}\left[X\right]\ge\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\operatorname{var}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\not e}[X]\right],\tag{3.58}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\not e}[X]:=\mathbb{E}\left[X\mid a(e)\right]$ is the conditional expectation of X, given conductivity $a(e)$ on the edge $e\in\mathbb{B}$ (this is not the Glauber derivative). We shall apply this inequality to the averaged homogenization commutator in direction $\mathbf{e}\otimes\mathbf{e}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_\varepsilon\;&:=\;\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi(\varepsilon z)\,\mathbf{e}\otimes\mathbf{e}:\rho(z)\,dz\\
&=\;\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi(\varepsilon z)\Big((\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)-2\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi-\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}\Big)(z)dz\\
&=\;\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon(z)\Big((\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)-2\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi-\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}\Big)(z)dz,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\chi:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^+$ is a smooth function supported in Q, ϕ denotes (in this proof only) the corrector in direction $\mathbf{e}$, and $\chi_\varepsilon(z):=\fint_{\varepsilon(z+Q)}\chi(x)dx$. We shall prove that there exists $\underline{\nu}>0$ such that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\downarrow0}\operatorname{var}\left[X_\varepsilon\right]\;\ge\;\underline{\nu}\|\chi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\tag{3.59}$$

Combined with Proposition 1 for $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{G}=\chi\mathbf{e}\otimes\mathbf{e}$, this implies the claim. We split the rest of the proof into four steps. For all $e\in\mathbb{B}$ we denote by $\boldsymbol{a}^e$ the random variable which coincides with $\boldsymbol{a}$ on the edges $e'\neq e$ and which is an independent copy $a^e(e)$ of $a(e)$ at edge e. We denote by ϕ^e the corrector associated with $\boldsymbol{a}^e$, and X_ε^e the associated averaged homogenization commutator. We also denote by σ (in this proof only) the flux corrector in direction $\mathbf{e}$ associated with $\boldsymbol{a}$, and σ^e the flux corrector associated with $\boldsymbol{a}^e$ (which are therefore skew-symmetric 2-tensors).

Step 1. Representation formula for $X_\varepsilon^e-X_\varepsilon$:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_\varepsilon^e-X_\varepsilon\;=\;&\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(z)dz\\
&-\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_k^*\chi_\varepsilon(\sigma_{jk}+\sigma_{jk}^e)(z-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j(\phi^e-\phi)(z)dz.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.60}$$

By definition of X_ε and X_ε^e,

$$\begin{aligned}X_\varepsilon &= \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\Big((\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)-2\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi+\nabla(\phi-\phi^e)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)\\&\qquad-\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}\Big)(z)dz,\\X_\varepsilon^e &= \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\Big((\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}^e(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)-2\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\phi^e+(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}^e\nabla(\phi^e-\phi)\\&\qquad-\mathbf{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}\Big)(z)dz,\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}X_\varepsilon^e-X_\varepsilon \;=\; &\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(z)dz\\&+\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\nabla(\phi^e-\phi)\cdot\Big(\boldsymbol{a}^e(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)+\boldsymbol{a}(e+\nabla\phi)-2\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}\Big)(z)dz.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{a}^e(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}=\nabla^*\cdot\sigma^e$, $\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}=\nabla^*\cdot\sigma$, and since σ and σ^e are skew-symmetric,

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla(\phi^e-\phi)\cdot\Big(\boldsymbol{a}^e(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)+\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)-2\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}\Big)(z)\\&\quad=\quad\nabla(\phi^e-\phi)\cdot\Big(\nabla^*\cdot(\sigma+\sigma^e)\Big)(z)\\&\quad\overset{(3.29)}{=}\quad\nabla_k\Big((\sigma_{jk}+\sigma^e_{jk})(z-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j(\phi^e-\phi)(z)\Big),\end{aligned}$$

and (3.60) follows by integration by parts.

Step 2. Proof of

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\varepsilon^d\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_k^*\chi_\varepsilon(\sigma_{jk}+\sigma^e_{jk})(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j(\phi^e-\phi)(z)dz\Big)^2\bigg]\\&\qquad\qquad\lesssim\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)(|\log\varepsilon|+1)\|\nabla\chi\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.61}$$

The difference $\phi^e-\phi$ satisfies

$$-\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{a}^e\nabla(\phi^e-\phi)\;=\;\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi),\tag{3.62}$$

so that the Green representation formula yields for $e=(x,x+\mathbf{e}_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla(\phi^e-\phi)(z)\;&=\;-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_z\nabla_yG^e(z,y)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(y)dy\\&=\;-\nabla_z\nabla_iG^e(z,x)(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(x)\cdot\mathbf{e}_i.\end{aligned}\tag{3.63}$$

In particular, by Lemmas 3.2, 3.5, and 3.8, and by Hölder's inequality, this yields for $e=(x,x+\mathbf{e}_i)$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_k^*\chi_\varepsilon(z)(\sigma_{jk}+\sigma^e_{jk})(z-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j(\phi^e-\phi)(z)dz\Big)^2\bigg]\\&\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla^*\chi_\varepsilon(z)||\nabla^*\chi_\varepsilon(z')|\mu_d(2+|z|)^{\frac12}\mu_d(2+|z'|)^{\frac12}\frac{1}{(1+|z-x|)^d(1+|z'-x|)^d}dzdz',\end{aligned}$$

from which (3.61) follows.

Step 3. Proof of

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{\phi}'}[(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(z)]\,dz\right)^2\right]\;>\;0. \tag{3.64}$$

Let $e=(x,x+\mathbf{e}_i)$. Then

$$\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{\phi}'}[(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(z)]\,dz\right)^2$$
$$=\;\varepsilon^d\chi_\varepsilon(x)^2(a^e(e)-a(e))^2\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{\phi}'}[([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(x))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^e(x))]^2\,,$$

so that by stationarity,

$$\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{\phi}'}[(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(z)]\,dz\right)^2\right]$$
$$=\;\left(\varepsilon^d\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon(x)^2dx\right)\sum_{i=1}^d\mathbb{E}\left[(a^{e_i}(e_i)-a(e_i))^2\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{\phi}_i}\left[([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))\right]^2\right]$$

where $e_i=(0,0+\mathbf{e}_i)$. We conclude by contradiction. To this aim we define for all $1\le i\le d$ the function $g_i:[\lambda,1]^2\to\mathbb{R},(\alpha,\alpha')\mapsto g_i(\alpha,\alpha')$ by

$$g_i(\alpha,\alpha'):=\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{\phi}_i}\left[([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))\,|\,a(e_i)=\alpha,a^{e_i}(e_i)=\alpha'\right].$$

We may then rewrite

$$\sum_{i=1}^d\mathbb{E}\left[(a^{e_i}(e_i)-a(e_i))^2\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{\phi}_i}\left[([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))\right]^2\right]$$
$$=\int_{[\lambda,1]^2}(\alpha-\alpha')^2\Big(\sum_{i=1}^d g_i(\alpha,\alpha')^2\Big)\pi(d\alpha)\pi(d\alpha'),$$

where π is the base measure associated with the product measure $\mathbb{P}=\pi^{\otimes\mathbb{B}}$. The claim (3.64) will follow from the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^d g_i(\alpha,\alpha')^2>0$ for all $\alpha,\alpha'\in[\lambda,1]^2$. Assume that for some $1\le i\le d$ and some $\alpha,\alpha'\in[\lambda,1]$, $g_i(\alpha,\alpha')=0$. Then, we first argue that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathscr{\phi}_i}$-almost surely, $([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))=0$ if $a(e_i)=\alpha$ and $a^{e_i}(e_i)=\alpha'$. The case $\alpha=\alpha'$ is trivial, and we consider $\alpha\neq\alpha'$. To this end, we appeal to (3.62) and shall prove that if $\alpha'-\alpha>0$, then

$$([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))\;\ge\;\frac{\lambda}{\alpha'-\alpha}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla(\phi-\phi^{e_i})(z)|^2dz+([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))^2\ge 0.$$

This is indeed a direct consequence of (3.62) in form of

$$-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi-\phi^{e_i})\;=\;-\nabla^*\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^{e_i}-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^{e_i}),$$

tested with the difference $\phi-\phi^{e_i}$ and integrated on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, which yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla(\phi-\phi^{e_i})\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\phi-\phi^{e_i})(z)dz$$
$$=\;([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))(\alpha'-\alpha)([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))-([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))^2(\alpha'-\alpha).$$

In particular, by changing the roles of $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}^{e_i}$, we have proved that for all $\alpha,\alpha'\in[\lambda,1]$,

$$([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))\ge 0. \tag{3.65}$$

Hence, if $g_i(\alpha,\alpha')=0$, that is, $\mathbb{E}_{\not e_i}\left[([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))\right]=0$, then, since the argument of the expectation has a sign, $([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))=0$ $\mathbb{P}_{\not e_i}$-almost surely. Next, we argue that this implies that $([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))=0$ $\mathbb{P}_{\not e_i}$-almost surely if $a(e_i)=\alpha$. Indeed, a reformulation of the same energy estimate as above yields

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla_i(\phi-\phi^{e_i})(0)|^2\le\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}|\nabla(\phi-\phi^{e_i})(z)|^2dz&\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla(\phi-\phi^{e_i})(z)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^{e_i}-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^{e_i})(z)\\&\le|\nabla_i(\phi^{e_i}-\phi)(0)||\alpha'-\alpha||[\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0)|,\end{aligned}$$

so that $([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))=0$ if $([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))=0$. Conversely, if $([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi(0))=0$ for $a(e_i)=\alpha$, then $([\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi^{e_i}(0))=0$ for all $a^{e_i}(e_i)=\alpha'\in[\lambda,1]$. In particular, if for some $\alpha,\alpha'\in[\lambda,1]$, $g_i(\alpha,\alpha')=0$, then $g_i\equiv0$ on $[\lambda,1]^2$. With the short-hand notation $\mathbb{E}_{e_i}[X]:=\mathbb{E}[X|a(e),e\neq e_i]$, we have by Jensen's inequality

$$[\mathbf{e}]_i^2=(\mathbb{E}[[\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi])^2\le\mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbb{E}_{e_i}[[\mathbf{e}]_i+\nabla_i\phi])^2\right]=\int_{[\lambda,1]^2}g_i(\alpha,\alpha')\pi(d\alpha)\pi(d\alpha').$$

Hence, if for all $\alpha,\alpha'\in[\lambda,1]$, $g_i(\alpha,\alpha')=0$, then $[\mathbf{e}]_i=0$. As this cannot hold for all $1\le i\le d$, it proves that for all $\alpha,\alpha'\in[\lambda,1]^2$, $\sum_{i=1}^d g_i(\alpha,\alpha')^2>0$, and therefore

$$\int_{[\lambda,1]^2}(\alpha-\alpha')^2\Big(\sum_{i=1}^d g_i(\alpha,\alpha')^2\Big)\pi(d\alpha)\pi(d\alpha')>0$$

provided π is not trivial. The desired estimate (3.64) now follows from the identity $\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow0}\varepsilon^d\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon(z)^2dz=\|\chi\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$.

Step 4. Proof of (3.59).
From (3.58) we deduce that

$$\operatorname{var}[X_\varepsilon]\ge\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[(X_\varepsilon-X_\varepsilon^e)^2\right],$$

since $\boldsymbol{a}^e$ coincides with $\boldsymbol{a}$ on edges $e'\neq e$ and is an independent copy of $\boldsymbol{a}$ at edge e. By Step 1 and Young's inequality, the RHS turns into

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\varepsilon\downarrow0}\operatorname{var}[X_\varepsilon]\ge\frac12\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\Big(\varepsilon^{\frac d2}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\chi_\varepsilon\mathbb{E}_{\not e}[(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(z)]\,dz\Big)^2\right]\\-\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\varepsilon^d\mathbb{E}\left[\Big(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_k^*\chi_\varepsilon\mathbb{E}_{\not e}\big[(\sigma_{jk}+\sigma_{jk}^e)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j(\phi^e-\phi)(z)\big]\,dz\Big)^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

By Jensen's inequality and Step 2,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow0}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\varepsilon^d\mathbb{E}\left[\Big(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_k^*\chi_\varepsilon\mathbb{E}_{\not e}\big[(\sigma_{jk}+\sigma_{jk}^e)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j(\phi^e-\phi)(z)\big]\,dz\Big)^2\right]=0,$$

so that (3.59) is finally a consequence of Step 3. The fact that $\underline{\nu}$ can be chosen independent of $\mathbf{e}$ follows from the fact that $\mathcal{Q}$ is a quadradic form, so that we may take the infimum over $\mathbf{e}$ in a finite set.

4. Normal approximation for the homogenization commutator

4.1. **Chatterjee's version of Stein's method.** The following proposition is the suitable form for our purpose of a result by Chatterjee [7] on normal approximation (to be seen as a "second-order Poincaré inequality"); it holds for any product measure $\mathbb{P}$ on Ω, and is based on Stein's method.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{N}$ denote the standard normal random variable. For all $X \in L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$ such that $\nu := \mathrm{var}\,[X] \neq 0$ and all $1 < p,q < \infty$ such that $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1$,*

$$d_W\left(\frac{X-\mathbb{E}\,[X]}{\sqrt{\nu}},\mathcal{N}\right) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e X|^3\right] + \frac{1}{\nu}\bigg(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\Big(\sum_{e'\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}X|^{2p}\right]^{\frac{1}{2p}}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}X|^{2q}\right]^{\frac{1}{2q}}\Big)^2\bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where d_W denotes the Wasserstein distance defined in (2.13). □

Proof. We split the proof into three steps. In the first step we introduce some notation, in the second step we prove the claim for local random variables (i. e., random variables that depend on a only through its values at finitely many edges), and we conclude in a third step by approximation.

Step 1. Notation.
Let $\{\mathbb{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing sequence of subsets of $\mathbb{B}$ of cardinal n such that $\mathbb{B}=\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{B}_n$. Fix n momentarily, and set $\Omega_n := [\lambda,1]^{\mathbb{B}_n} = \{\boldsymbol{a}_n\}$ and $\mathbb{P}_n := \pi^{\otimes\mathbb{B}_n}$. Let $X_n : \Omega_n \to \mathbb{R}$ be in $L^2(\Omega_n,\mathbb{P}_n)$ be a random variable, that we extend to $L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$ by setting $X_n(\boldsymbol{a}) := X_n(\boldsymbol{a}_n)$, where we have set $\boldsymbol{a}_n := \boldsymbol{a}|_{\mathbb{B}_n}$ for all $\boldsymbol{a}\in\Omega$. We need additional notation. Let $\boldsymbol{a}'$ be an i.i.d. copy of $\boldsymbol{a}$, and for all $A\subset\mathbb{B}_n$, define $\boldsymbol{a}^A$ as follows: $a^A(e)=a'(e)$ if $e\in A$ and $a^A(e)=a(e)$ otherwise (with this notation, we have $\boldsymbol{a}^e=\boldsymbol{a}^{\{e\}}$); we also set $X_n^A := X_n(\boldsymbol{a}^A)$. We are in position to define higher order differences:

$$T_{X_n}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}') \;:=\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}_n}\sum_{\substack{A\subset\mathbb{B}_n\\ A\not\ni e}} K_A(\Delta_e X_n)(\Delta_e X_n^A),$$

where the second sum runs over subsets of $\mathbb{B}_n$ (not containing the edge e), and $K_A := |A|!\frac{(n-|A|-1)!}{n!}$. Note that by definition $\sum_{A\subset\mathbb{B}_n, A\not\ni e} K_A = 1$ for any $e\in\mathbb{B}_n$. The aim is to prove a normal approximation for X_n, and we finally set

$$\nu_n := \mathrm{var}\,[X_n], \quad \mathcal{G}_n := \frac{X_n-\mathbb{E}\,[X_n]}{\sqrt{\nu_n}}.$$

Step 2. Application of Chatterjee's result on Ω_n.
Chatterjee's version of Stein's method, cf. [7, Theorem 2.2], yields the following bound on the Wasserstein distance:

$$d_W(\mathcal{G}_n,\mathcal{N}) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu_n^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e X_n|^3\right] + \frac{1}{\nu_n}\mathrm{var}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[T_{X_n}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}')\,|\,\boldsymbol{a}\right]\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.1}$$

Arguing as in [19, Proof of Proposition 7, Step 1], we simply bound

$$d_W(\mathcal{G}_n,\mathcal{N}) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu_n^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e X_n|^3\right] + \frac{1}{\nu_n}\left(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}_n}\Big(\sum_{e'\in\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}X_n|^2|\overline{\Delta_{e'}X_n}|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4.2)$$

where we have set for simplicity for any $e'\in\mathbb{B}_n$,

$$\overline{\Delta_{e'}X_n} := \sum_{\substack{A\subset\mathbb{B}_n\\ A\not\ni e'}} K_A\Delta_{e'}X_n^A.$$

Note that for all $q\geq 1$, since $\sum_{A\subset E_n, A\not\ni e'}K_A=1$ and X_n^A and X_n have the same law

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\overline{\Delta_{e'}X_n}|^q\right] \leq \sum_{\substack{A\subset\mathbb{B}_n\\ A\not\ni e'}} K_A\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}X_n^A|^q\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}X_n|^q\right].$$

Combined with Hölder's inequality in probability, the above estimate turns (4.2) for all p,q such that $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1$ into

$$d_W(\mathcal{G}_n,\mathcal{N}) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu_n}\left(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}_n}\Big(\sum_{e'\in\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}X_n|^{2p}\right]^{\frac{1}{2p}}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}X_n|^{2q}\right]^{\frac{1}{2q}}\Big)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{\nu_n^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{e'\in\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}X_n|^3\right]. \quad (4.3)$$

Step 3. Approximation argument.
Let $X\in L^2(\Omega)$, and for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, define $X_n := \mathbb{E}\left[X\,|\,\boldsymbol{a}_n\right]$ as the L^2-projection on $L^2(\Omega_n)$. By definition, $X_n\to X$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ so that $\nu_n=\operatorname{var}[X_n]\to\nu=\operatorname{var}[X]\neq 0$. Since for all $X,Y\in L^2(\Omega)$, $d_W(X,Y)\leq\|X-Y\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, we have

$$d_W\left(\frac{X-\mathbb{E}[X]}{\sqrt{\nu}},\mathcal{N}\right) \leq \limsup_{n\uparrow\infty} d_W(\mathcal{G}_n,\mathcal{N}).$$

By Jensen's inequality, for all $e,e'\in\mathbb{B}$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, and $1\leq p<\infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e X_n|^p\right]\leq\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e X|^p\right], \qquad \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}X_n|^p\right]\leq\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}X|^p\right],$$

so that (4.3) yields

$$d_W(\mathcal{G}_n,\mathcal{N}) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu_n}\left(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}_n}\Big(\sum_{e'\in\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}X|^{2p}\right]^{\frac{1}{2p}}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}X|^{2q}\right]^{\frac{1}{2q}}\Big)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{\nu_n^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{e'\in\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}X|^3\right].$$

Since $\nu_n\to\nu$, the conclusion follows from bounding sums over $\mathbb{B}_n$ by sums over $\mathbb{B}$. □

4.2. **Proof of Proposition 2.** We split the proof of the proposition into two main steps, first address (2.34) and then turn to (2.35). For both estimates the starting point is Lemma 4.1 with $p=q=2$. For (2.34) we may directly apply Lemma 4.1 to $\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})$. For (2.35) however, we first need to use the massive approximation $\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})$, and then optimize in T as a function of ε.

Step 1. Proof of (2.34).
By Lemma 4.1 with $p=q=2$, it is enough to estimate the two contributions:

$$K_1(\varepsilon) := \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})|^3\right],$$

$$K_2(\varepsilon) := \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \left(\sum_{e'\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'}\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})|^4\right]^{\frac14} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})|^4\right]^{\frac14}\right)^2.$$

We split the step into two substeps, and estimate K_1 and K_2 separately.

Substep 1.1. Proof of

$$K_1(\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \|\mathcal{F}\|^3_{W^{1,3}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Recall the formula (3.60) in the proof of Lemma 3.7:

$$\Delta_e\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}) = \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi^e)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathbf{e}+\nabla\phi)(x)dx - \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \nabla_k^*\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon\cdot(\sigma_{jk}+\sigma_{jk}^e)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\Delta_e\phi(x)dx, \quad (4.4)$$

and the following version of (3.62)

$$-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\Delta_e\phi(x) = \nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi^e(x)),$$

from which we deduce

$$\nabla\Delta_e\phi(x) = \nabla\nabla_e G(x,e)(a^e(e)-a(e))(\mathrm{Id}_e+\nabla_e\phi^e(e)), \quad (4.5)$$

where for all $X:\mathbb{Z}^d\to\mathbb{R}$, $\nabla_e X(e)$ is a notation for $\nabla_i X(z)$ for $e=(z,z+\mathbf{e}_i)$, and $\mathrm{Id}_e=\mathbf{e}_i$. By Lemmas 3.2, 3.5, and 3.8, we thus obtain

$$K_1(\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{3d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)|^3dx + \varepsilon^{\frac{3d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x_1)||\nabla\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x_2)||\nabla\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x_3)| \times \frac{(\log(2+|x_1|)\log(2+|x_2|)\log(2+|x_3|))^{\frac12}}{(1+|x_1-z|^d)(1+|x_2-z|^d)(1+|x_3-z|^d)}dx_1dx_2dx_3dz.$$

Since $\nabla\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ is supported in $Q+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathrm{supp}\,(\mathcal{F})$, a direct calculation yields

$$K_1(\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{3d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)|^3dx + \varepsilon^{\frac{3d}{2}}(1+|\log\varepsilon|)^{\frac92} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)|^3dx.$$

The conclusion follows from the definition of $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$, (3.32), and Jensen's inequality:

$$K_1(\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^3dx + \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}+3}(1+|\log\varepsilon|)^{\frac92} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |D\mathcal{F}(x)|^3dx.$$

Substep 1.2. Proof of

$$K_2(\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon^d(1+|\log\varepsilon|)^2\|\mathcal{F}\|^4_{W^{1,4}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

In addition to the results of Step 1, the proof requires to iterate the difference operator and estimate $\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})$. As in the first step, the starting point is (4.4). Fix momentarily $e'=(z',z'+\mathbf{e}_i)$ and $e=(z,z+\mathbf{e}_j)$. Taking the vertical derivative of (4.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}\tilde{I}_1^\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})\\
&\quad=\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon\Big(\nabla\Delta_e\phi^{e'}\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^{e'}-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi)+(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi^{e'e})\cdot\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}^{e'}-\boldsymbol{a})(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi)\\
&\qquad\qquad+(\mathrm{Id}+\nabla\phi^{e'e})\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^{e'e}-\boldsymbol{a}^e)\nabla\Delta_e\phi\Big)(x)dx\\
&\qquad-\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla_k^*\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon\Big(\Delta_e(\sigma_{jk}+\sigma_{jk}^{e'})(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_j\Delta_{e'}\phi+(\sigma_{jk}^e+\sigma_{jk}^{e'e})\nabla_j\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}\phi\Big)(x)dx.
\end{aligned}$$

We call $J_1(e,e')$ the first RHS term and $J_2(e,e')$ the second RHS term. The first contribution has essentially already been estimated (cf. Step 1 in the proof of Lemma 3.3, and Step 2 in the proof of Lemma 3.7), and we have for all $s\geq 1$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{a(e)}|J_1(e,e')|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}\lesssim_s\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(z')|\frac{1}{1+|z-z'|^d}.$$

The second contribution is new. We start with differentiating the equation (2.36) for σ:

$$-\triangle\Delta_e\sigma_{ijk}\;=\;\nabla_j^*\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_i+\mathbf{e}_i))_k-\nabla_k^*\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}(\nabla\phi_i+\mathbf{e}_i))_j,\tag{4.6}$$

so that by the formula (4.5) for the vertical derivative of $\nabla\phi$, the annealed bounds on the Green functions of Lemma 3.8 (and the bounds of the Green function of the discrete Laplacian), this yields for all $s\geq 1$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\sigma(x)|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}\lesssim_s\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\frac{1}{1+|x-y|^{d-1}}\frac{1}{1+|y-z|^d}dy\lesssim\frac{1}{1+|x-z|^{d-1}}.\tag{4.7}$$

We finally turn to the vertical derivative of

$$\nabla\Delta_{e'}\phi(x)\;=\;\nabla\nabla_{e'}G(x,e')(a^{e'}(e')-a(e'))(\mathrm{Id}_{e'}+\nabla_{e'}\phi^{e'}(e')).$$

The only new term here is when the vertical derivative falls on $\nabla\nabla_{e'}G(x,e')$, in which case we have the equation

$$-\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{a}^e\nabla\Delta_e\nabla_{e'}G(x,e')\;=\;\nabla\cdot(\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a})\nabla\nabla_{e'}G(x,e'),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_e\nabla\nabla_{e'}G(x,e')&=-\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\nabla\nabla G^e(x,y)\cdot(\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(y))\nabla\nabla_{e'}G(y,e')dy\\
&=-(a^e(e)-a(e))\nabla\nabla_eG^e(x,e)\nabla_e\nabla_{e'}G(e,e').
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.8 then yields for all $s\geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\nabla\nabla G(x,z')|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}\lesssim_s\frac{1}{(1+|x-z|^d)(1+|z-z'|^d)}.$$

We are in position to estimate J_2: for all $s \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|J_2(e,e')|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}} &\lesssim_s \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^* \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)| \Big(\frac{1}{(1+|x-z|^{d-1})(1+|x-z'|^d)} \\ &\qquad + \frac{\log(2+|x|)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(1+|x-z|^d)(1+|z-z'|^d)} \Big) dx \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^* \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)| \frac{1}{(1+|x-z|^{d-1})(1+|x-z'|^d)} dx.\end{aligned}$$

Now we may conclude. We first insert the bounds on J_1 and J_2 for $s=4$:

$$\begin{aligned}K_2(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{2d} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \bigg(\int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} \Big(|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(z')| + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^* \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)| \log(2+|x|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{1+|x-z'|^d} dx \Big) \\ \times \Big(|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(z')| \frac{1}{1+|z-z'|^d} + \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\nabla^* \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)| \frac{1}{(1+|x-z|^{d-1})(1+|x-z'|^d)} dx \Big) dz' \bigg)^2 dz.\end{aligned}$$

The second summand of the first factor is of higher order than the first summand, whereas the two summands of the second factor are of the same order. Expanding the square and bounding the sums as above finally yields the desired bound on $K_2(\varepsilon)$. The combination of the estimates of $K_1(\varepsilon)$ and $\sqrt{K_2(\varepsilon)}$ concludes the proof of (2.34).

Step 2. Proof of (2.35).
In this case we first address the claim for $\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})$, cf. Definition 3.2. Similarly as in Step 1, by Lemma 4.1 with $p=q=2$, it is enough to estimate the two contributions:

$$\begin{aligned}K_1(\varepsilon,T) &:= \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})|^3 \right], \\ K_2(\varepsilon,T) &:= \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \left(\sum_{e' \in \mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_{e'} \tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})|^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \Delta_{e'} \tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})|^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, it is enough to bound these terms with ϕ_T^κ replaced by ϕ_T, and we shall only work with the homogenization commutator

$$\bar{\rho}_T(x) := (\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T) \cdot \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T)(x) - \nabla\phi_T \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathrm{Id}(x) - \mathrm{Id} \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} \nabla\phi_T(x) - \boldsymbol{a}_{{\rm hom},T}$$

and the associated quantity $\bar{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})$ in the first two substeps dedicated to the control of $K_1(\varepsilon,T)$ and $K_2(\varepsilon,T)$. In the third and last substep, we shall come back to ϕ_T^κ, and choose T in function of ε (for which we shall appeal to (3.26) in the proof of Lemma 3.4).

Substep 2.1. Proof of

$$K_1(\varepsilon,T) \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}} (1+|\log T|)^3 \|\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

The starting point is this time (3.19) in the slightly modified form of

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_e \bar{\rho}_T(x) &= (\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T)(x) \cdot \Delta_e \boldsymbol{a}(x)(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T^e)(x) \\ &\quad + \nabla\Delta_e\phi_T(x) \cdot \Big(\boldsymbol{a}^e(x)(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T^e)(x) + \boldsymbol{a}(x)(\mathrm{Id} + \nabla\phi_T(x)) - 2\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathrm{Id} \Big), \quad (4.8)\end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding formula for $\nabla\Delta_e\phi_T$ (cf. Step 1 without massive approximation):

$$\nabla\Delta_e\phi_T(x) = -\nabla\nabla_e G_T(x,e)(a^e(e) - a(e))(\mathrm{Id}_e + \nabla_e\phi_T^e(e)). \quad (4.9)$$

The combination of (4.8) and (4.9) with Lemmas 3.2 and 3.8 yields for all $s \geq 1$ and $e = (z, z + \mathbf{e}_j)$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \bar{\rho}_T(x)|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}} \lesssim \frac{1}{1+|z-x|^d} \exp(-c\frac{|x-z|}{\sqrt{T}}),$$

from which we deduce the following two estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)| \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \bar{\rho}_T(x)|^3\right]^{\frac{1}{3}} dx \Big\} &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}(1+|\log T|), \\ \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^d} |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(x)| \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \bar{\rho}_T(x)|^3\right]^{\frac{1}{3}} dx &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-d}\|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}(1+|\log T|). \end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality, we then conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \bar{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})|^3\right] &\leq \sup_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \Big\{ \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \bar{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})|^3\right]^{\frac{1}{3}} \Big\}^2 \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e \bar{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})|^3\right]^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}(1+|\log T|)^3 \|\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Substep 2.2. Proof of

$$K_2(\varepsilon, T) \lesssim \varepsilon^d (1+|\log T|)^6 \|\mathcal{F}\|^3_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

We proceed as in Substep 1.2, with however as starting point formula (4.8). The only new term is when taking the vertical derivative Δ_e of $\Delta_{e'}\phi_T$. From (4.9) we learn that for $e = (z, z+\mathbf{e}_j) \neq e' = (z', z'+\mathbf{e}_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}\phi_T(x) \;=\; &-\nabla\nabla_{e'}\Delta_e G_T(x,e')(a^{e'}(e') - a(e'))(\mathrm{Id}_{e'} + \nabla_{e'}\phi_T^{e'}(e')) \\ &- \nabla\nabla_{e'} G_T^e(x,e')(a^{e'}(e') - a(e'))\nabla_{e'}\Delta_e\phi_T^{e'}(e'). \end{aligned}$$

From Substep 1.2 we know that

$$\nabla\nabla_{e'}\Delta_e G_T(x,e') \;=\; -(a^e(e) - a(e))\nabla\nabla_e G_T^e(x,e)\nabla_e\nabla_{e'} G_T(e,e'),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}\phi_T(x) \;=\; &\nabla\nabla_e G_T^e(x,e)\nabla_e\nabla_{e'} G_T(e,e')(a^e(e)-a(e))(a^{e'}(e')-a(e'))(\mathrm{Id}_{e'}+\nabla_{e'}\phi_T^{e'}(e')) \\ &+ \nabla\nabla_{e'} G_T^e(x,e')(a^{e'}(e') - a(e'))(a^e(e) - a(e))\nabla_{e'}\nabla_e G_T^{e'}(e,e')(\mathrm{Id}_e + \nabla_e\phi_T^{e'e}(e)). \end{aligned}$$

Combined with Lemmas 3.2 and 3.8, this yields for all $s \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\Delta_e\Delta_{e'}\nabla\phi_T(x)|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|x-z'|^d)(1+|z-z|^d)} \exp(-c\frac{|x-z'|+|z-z'|}{\sqrt{T}}).$$

The claim now follows from direct calculations, along the lines of Substeps 1.2 and 2.1.

Substep 2.3. Proof of (2.35).
The combination of Substeps 2.1 and 2.2 yields for all $T \gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned} d_W\left(\frac{\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}[\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})]}};\mathcal{N}\right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{d}{2}}(1+|\log T|)^3}{\mathrm{var}[\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \Big(&\|\mathcal{F}\|^{\frac{3}{2}}_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\mathcal{F}\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \sqrt{\mathrm{var}[\tilde{I}_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal{F})]} \\ &+ \|\mathcal{F}\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\mathcal{F}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \Big). \quad (4.10) \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, we learn from (3.31) that

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\right] \lesssim \Big(\varepsilon^2(\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^{-d}\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}+(\varepsilon T)^{-d}\Big)\|\mathcal F\|_{W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb R^d)}. \tag{4.11}$$

On the other hand, since the Wasserstein distance is controlled by the $L^2(\mathbb P)$-distance, and since $\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)$ and $\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)$ are centered, we have, with the notation $\nu_\varepsilon=\mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\right]$, $\nu_{\varepsilon,T}=\mathrm{var}[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
d_W\left(\frac{\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}};\frac{\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)}{\sqrt{\nu_\varepsilon}}\right) &\le \Big\|\frac{\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}}-\frac{\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)}{\sqrt{\nu_\varepsilon}}\Big\|_{L^2(\mathbb P)}\\
&\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}}\|\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\|_{L^2(\mathbb P)}+\frac{|\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}-\sqrt{\nu_\varepsilon}|}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}\nu_\varepsilon}}\|\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\|_{L^2(\mathbb P)}\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}}\mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\right]^{\frac12}+\frac{|\mathrm{var}[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)]^{\frac12}-\mathrm{var}[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)]^{\frac12}|}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}}\\
&\le \frac{2}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}}\mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon,T}(\mathcal F)-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\right]^{\frac12}\\
&\lesssim_{\alpha,q} \frac{\varepsilon(\varepsilon\sqrt{T})^{-\frac d2}\mu_d(\varepsilon)^{\frac12}+(\varepsilon T)^{-\frac d2}}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,T}}}\|\mathcal F\|_{W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb R^d)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This estimate for the choice $T=\varepsilon^{-6}$, combined with (4.10) and the triangle inequality, then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
d_W\left(\frac{\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}\left[\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\right]}};\mathcal N\right) &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^d}{\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon^{-6}}}}\|\mathcal F\|_{W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb R^d)}\\
&\quad+\frac{\varepsilon^{\frac d2}(1+|\log\varepsilon|)^3}{\nu_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon^{-6}}^{\frac32}}\Big(\|\mathcal F\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb R^d)}^{\frac32}\|\mathcal F\|_{L^1(\mathbb R^d)}^{\frac12}\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon^{-6}}}+\|\mathcal F\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb R^d)}^{2}\|\mathcal F\|_{L^1(\mathbb R^d)}\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

from which the claim follows using (4.11) in the form

$$|\sqrt{\nu_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon^{-6}}}-\sqrt{\nu_\varepsilon}|\le \mathrm{var}\left[I_3^{\varepsilon,\varepsilon^{-6}}(\mathcal F)-\tilde I_1^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal F)\right]^{\frac12}\lesssim \varepsilon^d\|\mathcal F\|_{W^{1,1}_{\log}(\mathbb R^d)}.$$

4.3. **Proof of Corollary 1.** By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3^\varepsilon(\mathcal F)-I_2^\varepsilon(DV) &= I_2^\varepsilon(\nabla_\varepsilon V)-I_2^\varepsilon(DV),\\
I_4^\varepsilon(\mathcal F)-I_2^\varepsilon((\boldsymbol a_{\rm hom}^{-1})'D\times W) &= I_2^\varepsilon((\boldsymbol a_{\rm hom}^{-1})'\nabla_\varepsilon\times W)-I_2^\varepsilon((\boldsymbol a_{\rm hom}^{-1})'D\times W),
\end{aligned}$$

so that the claim follows from Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 3.1.

5. Decomposition of the fluctuations of the solution

As emphasized in the introduction, in order to focus on fluctuations only and keep the arguments for discretization errors elementary, we consider continuum functions f_ε, g_ε, u_ε and v_ε, cf. (2.10), that solve discrete elliptic equations, and will systematically replace discrete sums by integrals in this section.

5.1. **Auxiliary lemmas and proof of Proposition 3.** We describe the string of arguments that leads to Proposition 3, and start with a suitable decomposition of $I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)$.

Lemma 5.1. *For $d\geq 2$ and for all $\bar u,\bar v\in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$ and $\varepsilon>0$, set $\bar u_\varepsilon:=\bar u(\varepsilon\cdot),\bar v_\varepsilon:=\bar v(\varepsilon\cdot):\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^d$, and for all $\varepsilon>0$, let $w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}$ and $w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}$ be the solutions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ of*

$$\begin{aligned}-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}=&\nabla^*\cdot((\boldsymbol{a}\phi_j-\sigma_j)\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)-\nabla_k^*\nabla_l^*(\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)\\&+\nabla^*\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon),\end{aligned}\tag{5.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}=&\nabla^*\cdot((\boldsymbol{a}\phi_m-\sigma_m)\nabla\nabla_m\bar v_\varepsilon)-\nabla_n^*\nabla_r^*(\sigma_{mnr}\nabla_r\nabla_m\bar v_\varepsilon)\\&+\nabla^*\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_n\nabla_n\phi_m\nabla_n\nabla_m\bar v_\varepsilon).\end{aligned}\tag{5.2}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon^{2-d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon\nabla_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon\\=&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\Xi\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_k\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar v_\varepsilon\\&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\\&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j+\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k+\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\\&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\\&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\mathbf{e}_l\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\mathbf{e}_m\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)(\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)\end{aligned}\tag{5.3}$$

almost surely. □

It remains to show that the last eight RHS terms of (5.3) are error terms. For the last four terms and for the third term, this follows from Lemma 3.6, while for the others it is a consequence of the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\bar u,\bar u_\varepsilon$ and $\bar v,\bar v_\varepsilon$ be as in Lemma 5.1. Then, for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac d2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\right]\\\lesssim_{\alpha,q}&\ \varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\frac12+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\frac12+\alpha}D^2\bar v\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\\&+\varepsilon^4\|D^2\bar u\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|D^2\bar v\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{5.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac d2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\right]\\\lesssim_{\alpha,q}&\ \varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\frac12+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\frac12+\alpha}D^2\bar v\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\\&+\varepsilon^4\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}D^2\bar v\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2+\varepsilon^4\|D^2\bar u\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|D^2\bar v\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac d2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\right]\\\lesssim_{\alpha,q}&\ \varepsilon^4\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}D^2\bar v\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2+\varepsilon^4\|D^2\bar u\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|D^2\bar v\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.6}$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Let $w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}$ and $w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}$ be as in Lemma 5.1. Then, for all $0<\alpha\ll 1$ and all $p\gg 1$ such that $\alpha p>d$, we have*

$$\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}\right]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar v\|^2_{L^2\cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|^2_{L^2\cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.\quad(5.7)$$

□

Before we turn to the proofs of Lemmas 5.1–5.3, let us argue how Proposition 3 follows from these auxiliary lemmas and Lemma 3.6. Since

$$\varepsilon^{2-d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon\nabla_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon=\varepsilon^{2-\frac{d}{2}}I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)+\varepsilon^{2-d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\left[\nabla_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_\varepsilon\nabla_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon(x)\right]dx,$$
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\Xi\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon=\varepsilon^{2-\frac{d}{2}}I_1^\varepsilon(\nabla_\varepsilon\bar u\otimes\nabla_\varepsilon\bar v),$$

the decomposition (5.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{var}\left[I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u,\bar v)+I_1^\varepsilon(\nabla_\varepsilon\bar u\otimes\nabla_\varepsilon\bar v)\right]\\&\lesssim\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}\right]+\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_k\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar v_\varepsilon\right]\\&\qquad+\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\right]\\&\quad+\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j+\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k+\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\right]\\&+\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\right]+\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\right]\\&\qquad+\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\mathbf{e}_l\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\right]\\&\qquad+\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\mathbf{e}_m\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)(\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)\right].\quad(5.8)\end{aligned}$$

The first, third, and fourth RHS terms are estimated in Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 above, so it remains to estimate the second and the last four RHS terms. By (3.12) in Lemma 3.6 for $\eta_\varepsilon=\nabla_k\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_j\bar v_\varepsilon$, we obtain for all $0<\alpha\ll1$ and $q>2$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla\phi_k\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar v_\varepsilon\right]&\lesssim\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D(D\bar u\otimes D\bar v)\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\&\lesssim\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\|D\bar u\|^2_{W^{2,2q}_{\frac12+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|D\bar v\|^2_{W^{2,2q}_{\frac12+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.\end{aligned}$$

Likewise, by (3.11) in Lemma 3.6 for $\chi_\varepsilon = \nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon$, we obtain for all $0<\alpha\ll 1$ and $q>2$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{var}\left[\varepsilon^{-2+\frac{d}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon\right]\\&\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{1+\alpha}D(D^2\bar{u}\otimes D\bar{v})\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}D^2\bar{u}\otimes D\bar{v}\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\&\lesssim\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\|D\bar{u}\|^2_{W^{2,2q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|D\bar{v}\|^2_{W^{2,2q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)},\end{aligned}$$

which we use to estimate the fifth and sixth RHS terms of (5.8). We finally turn to the last two RHS terms of (5.8). By the discrete estimate $|\nabla_l\phi_j(x)|\le|\phi_j(x+\mathbf{e}_l)|+|\phi_j(x)|$, these terms satisfy the same bounds as the fourth and fifth RHS terms. The combination of these estimates of the seven RHS terms of (5.8) then yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}\,[I_2^\varepsilon(\bar{u},\bar{v})+I_1^\varepsilon(\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{u}\otimes\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{v})]\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\varepsilon^2\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\|D\bar{u}\|^2_{W^{2,2q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|D\bar{v}\|^2_{W^{2,2q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\+\varepsilon^4\mu_d(\varepsilon)\|\mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac{1}{2}}D^2\bar{u}\|^2_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac{1}{2}}D^2\bar{v}\|^2_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}.\end{aligned}$$

Appealing to Corollary 3.1 in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}\,[I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar{u}\otimes D\bar{v}-\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{u}\otimes\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{v})]&\lesssim_{\alpha,q}\|D\bar{u}\otimes D\bar{v}-\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{u}\otimes\nabla_\varepsilon\bar{v}\|^2_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\&\lesssim\varepsilon^2\|D(D\bar{u}\otimes D\bar{v})\|^2_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\lesssim\varepsilon^2\|D\bar{u}\|^2_{W^{2,4}\cap W^{2,2q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|D\bar{v}\|^2_{W^{2,4}\cap W^{2,2q}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)}\end{aligned}$$

concludes the proof of Proposition 3.

5.2. **Proof of Lemma 5.1.** By scaling, it is enough to prove the result for $\varepsilon=1$. In view of the relation

$$\rho=\Xi-\nabla\phi\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma)$$

(cf. proof of Lemma 2.1), it remains to prove

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla v\\&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{hom}}\nabla\bar{v}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar{u}\cdot\rho\nabla\bar{v}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar{u}}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v}}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar{v}\\&\quad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar{v}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar{v}\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar{u}\\&\quad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\mathbf{e}_l\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}\nabla_k\bar{v})-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\mathbf{e}_m\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)(\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v}\nabla_j\bar{u})\\&\quad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j+\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k+\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v})\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m.\end{aligned}\tag{5.9}$$

We first argue in the case of continuum operators (cf. Remark 2.20) and then turn to the modifications due to discreteness.

Step 1. Proof of the continuum version of (5.9):

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Du\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dv&\\ =&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}D\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\bar u\cdot\rho D\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Dw_{\bar u}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar v}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k DD_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}DD_k\bar v\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j DD_j\bar u\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k DD_k\bar v\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar u.\end{aligned}\tag{5.10}$$

We split this step into two substeps, and shall use the short-hand notation $\tilde\rho_{ij}$ for the energy density

$$\tilde\rho_{ij}:=(\mathbf{e}_i+D\phi_i)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+D\phi_j).\tag{5.11}$$

Substep 1.1. Proof of

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Du\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dv=&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\bar u\cdot\tilde\rho D\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Dw_{\bar u}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar v}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k DD_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}DD_k\bar v\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar v+\phi_kD_k\bar v)\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_j)D_j\bar u.\end{aligned}\tag{5.12}$$

This identify is a direct consequence of the following four formulas:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Du\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dv&\\ =&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}D(\bar v+\phi_kD_k\bar v)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Dw_{\bar u}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar v}\\ &+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar v}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar v+\phi_kD_k\bar v)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar u},\end{aligned}\tag{5.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}D(\bar v+\phi_kD_k\bar v)&\\ =&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\bar u\cdot\tilde\rho D\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_kDD_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}DD_k\bar v\\ &+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_jDD_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_k+D\phi_k)D_k\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_kDD_k\bar v\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+D\phi_j)D_j\bar u,\end{aligned}\tag{5.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar v}&\\ =&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_kDD_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}DD_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_kDD_k\bar v\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+D\phi_j)D_j\bar u,\end{aligned}\tag{5.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar v+\phi_kD_k\bar v)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar u}&\\ =&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar v+\phi_kD_k\bar v)\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_j)D_j\bar u\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_kDD_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}DD_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_jDD_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_k+D\phi_k)D_k\bar v.\end{aligned}\tag{5.16}$$

Formulas (5.13) and (5.14) are trivial, whereas (5.15) and (5.16) are identical (up to changing the roles of $\bar u$ and $\bar v$). The proof of (5.15) is as follows. Since $w_{\bar v}$ satisfies

$$-D\cdot \boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar v} \;=\; D\cdot((\boldsymbol{a}\phi_k-\sigma_k)DD_k\bar v), \tag{5.17}$$

the LHS of (5.15) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot \boldsymbol{a}Dw_{\bar v}\\
&\quad= \quad -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}\phi_k-\sigma_k)DD_k\bar v\\
&\quad= \quad -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_j\phi_kDD_j\bar u\cdot \boldsymbol{a}DD_k\bar v\\
&\qquad\quad -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D_j\bar u(\mathbf{e}_j+D\phi_j)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\phi_kDD_k\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot\sigma_kDD_k\bar v.
\end{aligned}$$

By skew-symmetry of σ_k, one may rewrite the last term as

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot\sigma_kDD_k\bar v \;&=\; -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\cdot(D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v\\
&=\; -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v,
\end{aligned}$$

and (5.15) is proved.

Substep 1.2. Proof of (5.10).
The claim follows from (5.12), the definition (2.28) of the homogenization commutator, and the following identity (and the corresponding identity when switching the roles of $\bar u$ and $\bar v$):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v\\
&\qquad=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D\bar u\cdot\rho D\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D_j\bar uD\phi_j\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_kD_k\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_jDD_j\bar u\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.18}$$

This identity is a direct consequence of (2.39), which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D(\bar u+\phi_jD_j\bar u)\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v\\
&\quad=\quad\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_jDD_j\bar u\cdot(D\cdot\sigma_k)D_k\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D_j\bar u(\mathbf{e}_j+D\phi_j)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_k+D\phi_k)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_k)D_k\bar v,
\end{aligned}$$

that is, (5.18), after rearranging the terms.

Step 2. Proof of (5.9).
We argue as in the continuum setting, and use the short-hand notation

$$\tilde\rho_{ij}:=(\mathbf{e}_i+\nabla\phi_i)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j).$$

Substep 1. Discrete proxy for (5.12):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla v\\
&\quad=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar u\cdot\tilde\rho\nabla\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar u}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar v+\phi_k\nabla_k\bar v)\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\bar u\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j+\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k+\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.19}$$

Note that the last term is a discrete correction. This identity is a consequence of the following discrete versions of (5.13)–(5.16). Formula (5.13) remains essentially unchanged:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla v\\
&\quad=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\bar v+\phi_k\nabla_k\bar v)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar u}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v}\\
&\qquad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar v+\phi_k\nabla_k\bar v)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u}.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.20}$$

Formula (5.14) is modified by the discrete Leibniz rule (3.28) which yields (the last) three correcting terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla(\bar v+\phi_k\nabla_k\bar v)\\
&\quad=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar u\cdot\tilde\rho\nabla\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v\\
&\qquad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_k+\nabla\phi_k)\nabla_k\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar v\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\nabla_j\bar u\\
&\qquad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_k+\nabla\phi_k)\nabla_k\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v\mathbf{e}_m\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\nabla_j\bar u\\
&\qquad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j+\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k+\nabla_l\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.21}$$

We then turn to the discrete proxy for formula (5.15). We rewrite the defining equation for $w_{\bar v}$

$$-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v}\;=\;\nabla^*\cdot((\boldsymbol{a}\phi_k-\sigma_k)DD_k\bar v),$$

in the form

$$-\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v}=\nabla^*\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar v)-\nabla^*_m(\sigma_{kmn}\nabla_n\nabla_k\bar v)(\cdot-\mathbf{e}_n)+\nabla^*\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v).\tag{5.22}$$

Combined with the Leibniz rule (3.28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v}\\
&\quad= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_m(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)(x)(\sigma_{kmn}\nabla_n\nabla_k\bar v)(x-\mathbf{e}_n)dx\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar v\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\nabla_j\bar u,\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_j\bar u(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m.
\end{aligned}$$

To reformulate the first RHS term, we need a discrete proxy of the continuum identity $(D_lD_j\chi)\sigma_{jkl}=-(D_l\sigma_{jkl})D_j\chi$ which follows from the skew-symmetry of σ. By the discrete Leibniz rule in form of $\nabla_l^*(\chi_1(x+\mathbf{e}_l)\chi_2(x))=(\nabla_l\chi_1(x))\chi_2(x)+\chi_1(x)\nabla_l^*\chi_2(x)$, we obtain by skew-symmetry of σ for all compactly supported χ_1,χ_2:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\chi_1(x)(\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_l\nabla_j\chi_2)(x-\mathbf{e}_l)dx\\
&\quad=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\chi_1(x+\mathbf{e}_l)(\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_l\nabla_j\chi_2)(x)dx\\
&\quad=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l^*(\nabla_k\chi_1(x+\mathbf{e}_l)\sigma_{jkl}(x))\nabla_j\chi_2(x)dx\\
&\quad=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_k\chi_1\nabla_l^*\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_j\chi_2(x)dx-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\nabla_l\nabla_k\chi_1)\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_j\chi_2(x)dx\\
&\quad=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\chi_1\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_j)\nabla_j\chi_2(x)dx. \qquad (5.23)
\end{aligned}$$

Applied with $\chi_1=\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u$ and $\chi_2=\bar v$, the first RHS term above turns into

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)(x)(\sigma_{kmn}\nabla_n\nabla_k\bar v)(x-\mathbf{e}_n)dx=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v(x)dx,$$

so that the discrete proxy for (5.15) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar v}\\
&\quad=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v(x)dx\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla\nabla_k\bar v\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\nabla_j\bar u,\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_j\bar u(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v\\
&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k+\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j+\nabla_l\phi_j\nabla_m\phi_k)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m, \qquad (5.24)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last two terms are discrete corrections. A similar formula holds with $\bar u$ replaced by $\bar v$, and $w_{\bar v}$ replaced by $w_{\bar u}$.

As announced, (5.19) follows from (5.20)–(5.24).

Substep 2.2. Proof of (5.9).
We first argue that the discrete proxy for (5.18) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar u\cdot\tilde\rho\nabla\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_j\bar u\nabla\phi_j\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\bar v\\ &\quad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar u\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\nabla\bar v\\ &\quad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\mathbf{e}_l\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v. \qquad (5.25)\end{aligned}$$

This identity is a direct consequence of (2.39) and of the discrete Leibniz rule, which yield

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\bar u+\phi_j\nabla_j\bar u)\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v\\ &\quad=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_j\bar u(\mathbf{e}_j+\nabla\phi_j)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{e}_k+\nabla\phi_k)-\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_k)\nabla_k\bar v\\ &\qquad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_l\phi_j\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u\mathbf{e}_l\cdot(\nabla^*\cdot\sigma_k)\nabla_k\bar v,\end{aligned}$$

that is, (5.25), after rearranging the terms.

The desired formula (5.9) now follows from the combination of (5.19) and (5.25).

5.3. **Proof of Lemma 5.2.** We split the proof into four steps and deal with $d>2$ and $d=2$ separately.

Step 1. Proof of (5.4) for $d>2$.
By the variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 together with the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}^e)$ (cf. proof of Lemma 3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{var}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\Big]\lesssim\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\Big|^2\Big]}_{=:T_1^\varepsilon}\\ &+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\Delta_e\phi_k)\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\Big|^2\Big]}_{=:T_2^\varepsilon}+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\Delta_e\phi_j)\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\Big|^2\Big]}_{=:T_3^\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Denote by T_1^ε, T_2^ε and T_3^ε the three RHS terms. Using the identity $\Delta_e a(x)=(a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z_e)\mathbf{e}_e\otimes\mathbf{e}_e$, we may estimate T_1^ε by

$$T_1^\varepsilon\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\left[|\phi_j(z)|^2|\phi_k(z)|^2\right]|\nabla\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon(z)|^2|\nabla\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon(z)|^2dz,$$

and hence, by Lemma 3.5 (for $d>2$) in the form $\mathbb{E}\left[|\phi|^4\right]\lesssim1$, and rescaling the integrals,

$$\begin{aligned}T_1^\varepsilon\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\nabla\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon(z)|^2|\nabla\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon(z)|^2dz&\le\|\nabla\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\nabla\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ &\lesssim\varepsilon^{8-d}\|D^2\bar u\|^2_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|D^2\bar v\|^2_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \qquad (5.26)\end{aligned}$$

Now we turn to the last two terms T_2^ε and T_3^ε. Observe that they do have the same structure as the last RHS term of (3.46) in Step 6 of the proof of Lemma 3.6, with σ replaced by $\boldsymbol{a}\phi$ and with the test function $\nabla\chi_\varepsilon$ replaced by $\nabla\nabla\bar{u}_\varepsilon\otimes\nabla\nabla\bar{v}_\varepsilon$. The same string of arguments then shows that for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned}T_2^\varepsilon+T_3^\varepsilon&\lesssim\varepsilon^{6-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^{1+\alpha}|D^2\bar{u}||D^2\bar{v}|\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\\&\le\varepsilon^{6-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\frac12+\alpha}D^2\bar{u}\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\frac12+\alpha}D^2\bar{v}\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

The claim (5.4) for $d>2$ follows.

Step 2. Proof of (5.6).
By the variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 together with the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}^e)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\right]\\&\qquad\lesssim\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\right|^2\right]}_{=:S_1^\varepsilon}\\&\qquad+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla_m\phi_k(\nabla_l\Delta_e\phi_j)(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\right|^2\right]}_{=:S_2^\varepsilon}\\&\qquad+\underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\nabla_m\Delta_e\phi_k)\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar{v}_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\right|^2\right]}_{=:S_3^\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

We denote by S_1^ε, S_2^ε and S_3^ε the three RHS terms. Using the identity $\Delta_e a(x)=(a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z_e)\mathbf{e}_e\otimes\mathbf{e}_e$, Lemma 3.5 in the form $\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi|^4\right]\lesssim1$, and rescaling the integrals, we estimate S_1^ε by

$$\begin{aligned}S_1^\varepsilon&\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla\phi_j(z)|^2|\nabla\phi_k(z)|^2\right]|\nabla\nabla\bar{u}_\varepsilon(z)|^2|\nabla\nabla\bar{v}_\varepsilon(z)|^2dz\\&\lesssim\|\nabla\nabla\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|\nabla\nabla\bar{v}_\varepsilon\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\lesssim\varepsilon^{8-d}\|D^2\bar{u}\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|D^2\bar{v}\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

We turn to S_2^ε and S_3^ε and observe that they do have the same structure as the first RHS term in (3.35) in Step 2 of the proof of Lemma 3.6, with σ replaced by $\boldsymbol{a}\otimes\nabla\phi$ and with the test function $\nabla\eta_\varepsilon$ replaced by $\nabla\nabla\bar{u}_\varepsilon\otimes\nabla\nabla\bar{v}_\varepsilon$. The same string of arguments then shows that for all $\alpha>0$ and $q>2$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned}S_2^\varepsilon+S_3^\varepsilon&\lesssim\varepsilon^{8-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}|D^2\bar{u}||D^2\bar{v}|\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\\&\le\varepsilon^{8-d}\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}D^2\bar{u}\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|(1+|\cdot|)^{\alpha}D^2\bar{v}\|_{L^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

The claim (5.6) is proved.

Step 3. Proof of (5.5) for $d>2$.

By the variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 together with the exchangeability of $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{a}^e)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\bigg]&\\ \lesssim\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\Big|^2\bigg]&\\ +\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\Delta_e\phi_k)\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\Big|^2\bigg]&\\ +\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\phi_k\nabla_l\Delta_e\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\Big|^2\bigg].&\end{aligned}$$

The first RHS term is bounded directly using the identity $\Delta_e a(x)=(a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z_e)\mathbf{e}_e\otimes\mathbf{e}_e$, the second RHS term is estimated as in Step 1 (for $d>2$), and the last RHS term is estimated as in Step 2, so that (5.5) follows for $d>2$.

Step 4. Proof of (5.4) and (5.5) for $d=2$.
We start with (5.4). By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\bigg]&\le\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\Big|^2\bigg]\\ &\lesssim\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\mathbb{E}\Big[|\phi_j(x)\phi_k(x)\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon(x)\cdot\boldsymbol{a}(x)\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon(x)|^2\Big]^{\frac12}dx\bigg)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, Lemma 3.5 in the form $\mathbb{E}\big[|\phi(x)|^4\big]^{\frac14}\lesssim\log(2+|x|)^{\frac12}$ and a rescaling of the integrals yield

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\phi_j\phi_k\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon\bigg]&\lesssim\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\log(2+|x|)|\nabla\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon(x)||\nabla\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon(x)|dx\bigg)^2\\ &\lesssim\|\log(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}\nabla\nabla\bar u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|\log(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}\nabla\nabla\bar v_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\\ &\lesssim\varepsilon^4|\log\varepsilon|^2\|\log(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}D^2\bar u\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|\log(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}D^2\bar v\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves (5.4) for $d=2$. Likewise, for (5.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{var}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\phi_k\nabla_l\phi_j(\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\nabla_m\nabla_k\bar v_\varepsilon)\mathbf{e}_l\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_m\bigg]&\\ \lesssim\varepsilon^4|\log\varepsilon|\|\log(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac14}D^2\bar u\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|\log(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac14}D^2\bar v\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)},&\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

5.4. **Proof of Lemma 5.3.** We prove (5.7) with p replaced by $2p$ for notational convenience, and shall assume that $2\alpha p>d$. Let the exponents p and q be related by $\frac1p+\frac1q=\frac12$, where we think of $1\ll p<\infty$ and thus $0<q-2\ll1$. We let w_ε and w_1 be as in the proof of Lemma 3.6.

Step 1. Maximal regularity for $w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}$: For all $0<\alpha\ll 1$ and $p\gg 1$ such that $2p\alpha>d$, and for all $r\geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^r\right]^{\frac{1}{r}}\lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2p}}\|\mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{5.27}$$

The starting point is the discrete version of the Calderón-Zygmund estimate of Proposition 4 (cf. Appendix A) applied to (5.1) (see also (5.22)), which yields

$$\|r_*^{-\frac{d}{2}}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\lesssim \|(|\phi|+|\sigma|+\sum_i|\sigma(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_i)|+|\phi(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_i)|)\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \tag{5.28}$$

where r_* is the (stationary) minimal radius (cf. Proposition 4). By Hölder's inequality (after introducing the weight $w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$), we use the above in form of

$$\begin{aligned}&\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ \leq\ &\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\ r_*^{\frac{d}{2}}\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|r_*^{-\frac{d}{2}}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ \lesssim\ &\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\ r_*^{\frac{d}{2}}\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|(|\phi|+|\sigma|+\sum_i|\sigma(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_i)|+|\phi(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_i)|)\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

From [16] (the adaptation of which in the discrete setting is straightforward) we learn that all the moments of r_* are finite, so that the claim follows from Lemma 3.5 and the assumption $2p\alpha>d$.

Step 2. Application of the variance estimate.
The variance estimate of Lemma 3.1 yields

$$\operatorname{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}\right]\lesssim\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Delta_e(\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon})\right|^2\right]. \tag{5.30}$$

Since

$$\Delta_e(\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon})\ =\ \nabla(\Delta_e w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon})\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}+\nabla w^e_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\cdot\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}),$$

(5.30) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}\right]\ \lesssim\ &\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla(\Delta_e w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon})\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}\right|^2\right]\\ &+\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla w^e_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\cdot\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon})\right|^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Using that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla w^e_{\bar{u},\varepsilon} \cdot \Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon})$ and $-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon} \cdot \Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon})$ have the same law, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{var}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon} \cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}\right] \lesssim \underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla(\Delta_e w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}) \cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}\right|^2\right]}_{=:\,(T_1^\varepsilon)^2} \\ + \underbrace{\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon} \cdot \Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon})\right|^2\right]}_{=:\,(T_2^\varepsilon)^2}. \quad (5.31)\end{aligned}$$

Step 3. Proof of (5.7).
The desired estimate (5.7) follows from the combination of (5.31) with the bound

$$T^\varepsilon \lesssim \varepsilon^{6-d}\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2 \|w_1^{1+\alpha} D^2\bar{v}\|^2_{L^2\cap L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|w_1^{1+\alpha} D^2\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2\cap L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (5.32)$$

which we prove now by duality. We let $(\omega_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$ be in $\ell^2(\mathbb{B})$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} T_1^\varepsilon(\omega) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \nabla(\Delta_e w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}) \cdot \boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}, \\ T_2^\varepsilon(\omega) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon} \cdot \Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

We insert the weights w_ε^α and $w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ for $0<\alpha\ll 1$ in the definition of $T_1^\varepsilon(\omega)$ and $T_2^\varepsilon(\omega)$, and use Hölder's inequality with dual exponents q and q' in space and Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality in probability:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[T_1^\varepsilon(\omega)^2 + T_2^\varepsilon(\omega)^2\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \nabla(\Delta_e w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon})\right\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right]^{\frac12} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|w_\varepsilon^{\alpha}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon}\right\|^4_{L^{q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right]^{\frac12} \\ + \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}} \omega_e \Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar{v},\varepsilon})\right\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right]^{\frac12} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|w_\varepsilon^{\alpha}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\right\|^4_{L^{q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right]^{\frac12}. \quad (5.33)\end{aligned}$$

By Meyers' estimate (3.33) on the equations (5.1) & (5.2) (cf. (5.22)), which holds because $|q-2|\ll 1$ and $|\alpha|\ll 1$,

$$\left\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha \nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \left\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha(|\phi|+|\sigma|+\sum_i |\sigma(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_i)|+|\phi(\cdot+\mathbf{e}_i)|)\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

so that by Lemma 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|w_\varepsilon^{\alpha}\nabla w_{\bar{u},\varepsilon}\right\|^4_{L^{q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right]^{\frac12} &\lesssim \left\|w_\varepsilon^\alpha \mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\right\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{4-\frac{2d}{q}}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\left\|w_1^\alpha \mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12} D^2\bar{u}\right\|^2_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (5.34)\end{aligned}$$

In order to control the first factors of the two RHS terms of (5.33), we appeal to the vertical derivative of equation (5.1), that takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}) &= -\nabla^*\cdot\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\Delta_e w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}-\nabla^*\cdot\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w^e_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\\ &= \nabla^*\cdot((\phi^e_j\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}+\boldsymbol{a}\Delta_e\phi_j-\Delta_e\sigma_j)\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)\\ &\quad -\nabla^*\cdot(\mathbf{e}_k\nabla^*_l(\Delta_e\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon))+\nabla^*\cdot(\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)\\ &\quad +\nabla^*\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

We apply Meyers' estimate (3.33) to this equation, which holds because of $|q'-2|,|\alpha|\ll 1$, to the effect of

$$\begin{aligned} &\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon})\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ &\lesssim \|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w^e_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e(\phi^e_j\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}+\boldsymbol{a}\Delta_e\phi_j-\Delta_e\sigma_j)\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ &\quad +\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla^*_l(\Delta_e\sigma_{jkl}\nabla_l\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon)\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ &\quad +\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\boldsymbol{a}^e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

where we recall that q' is the dual exponent to q. When taking moments of (5.36), one may replace $\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w^e_{\bar u,\varepsilon}$, $\phi^e_j\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}$, and $\boldsymbol{a}^e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j$ by $-\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}$, $-\phi_j\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}$, and $-\boldsymbol{a}\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j$, respectively, in the first, second, and last RHS terms since these terms have the same law. Using in addition the discrete estimate $|\nabla\chi(x)|\le|\chi(x)|+\sum_i|\chi(x+\mathbf{e}_i)|$ on the third RHS term (which is itself a correction due to discreteness), we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon})\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\bigg]\\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\bigg]+\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\phi_j\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\bigg]\\ &\quad +\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e(\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a})\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\bigg]+\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\bigg]\\ &\quad +\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\bigg]+\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\sigma_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\bigg]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

The only new term is the first RHS term of (5.37), which we treat in detail. For $e\in\mathbb{B}$ we use the notation $e=(z_e,z_e+\mathbf{e}_e)$. Since $\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}(x)=(a^e(e)-a(e))\delta(x-z_e)\mathbf{e}_e\otimes\mathbf{e}_e$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ &\qquad=\Big(\sum_e|\omega_e|^{q'}|a^e(e)-a(e)|^{q'}\int_Q w_\varepsilon(z_e+x)^{-\alpha q'}|\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}(z_e+x)\cdot\mathbf{e}_e|^{q'}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{q'}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality with exponents $(\frac{p+2}{p},\frac{p+2}{2})$ (recall that $\frac{1}{q'}=1-\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{p}$),

$$\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \le \Big(\sum_e\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

Combined with the maximal regularity result of Step 1, this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\bigg]^{\frac12}\\
&\lesssim\ \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{p}}\Big(\sum_e\omega_e^2\Big)\|\mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}\nabla^2\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\\
&\lesssim\ \varepsilon^{4-\frac{2d}{p}}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\Big(\sum_e\omega_e^2\Big)\|\mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}D^2\bar u\|_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \qquad (5.38)
\end{aligned}$$

We now turn to the last five RHS terms of (5.37). The second and third RHS terms are the easiest, we treat them together: as above, by Hölder's inequality with exponents $(\frac{p+2}{p},\frac{p+2}{2})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\phi_j\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a}\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e(\Delta_e\boldsymbol{a})\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\bigg]^{\frac12}\\
&\le\ \Big(\sum_e\omega_e^2\Big)\mathbb{E}\Big[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\phi_j\nabla^2\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla_k\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\Big]^{\frac12}\\
&\lesssim\ \Big(\sum_e\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\mu_d(2+|\cdot|)^{\frac12}\nabla^2\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\\
&\lesssim\ \varepsilon^{4-\frac{2d}{p}}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\Big(\sum_e\omega_e^2\Big)\|D^2\bar u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \qquad (5.39)
\end{aligned}$$

For the fourth and fifth RHS terms we proceed as in Steps 6 and 8 in the proof of Lemma 3.6. We first insert the weight w_1 and then distinguish the cases $d=2$ and $d>2$. For $d>2$ we use Hölder's inequality with exponents (s,s') for $s=\frac{p+2}{p+1}$ to the effect

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\bigg]^{\frac12}\\
&\qquad\le\ \mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-1}\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{sq'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-1}\nabla\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{sq'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\bigg]^{\frac12}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\times\|w_1\nabla^2\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{s'q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which, by the discrete estimate $|\nabla\chi(x)|\le|\chi(x)|+\sum_{i=1}^d|\chi(x+\mathbf{e}_i)|$, turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\bigg]^{\frac12}\\
&\qquad\le\ \mathbb{E}\bigg[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}w_1^{-1}\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{sq'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\bigg]^{\frac12}\|w_1\nabla^2\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{s'q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $sq' = \frac{2p}{p+1} < 2$ and $\frac{1}{sq'} + \frac{1}{2p} = \frac{1}{2}$, we may appeal to (3.49) and conclude that, in view of $s'q' = \frac{2ps'}{p+2} = 2p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e \Delta_e\phi_j \nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}4 + \|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e \mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right]^{\frac12}\\
\lesssim\ & \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{p}}\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
\lesssim\ & \varepsilon^{2-\frac{2d}{p}}\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1 D^2\bar{u}\|^2_{L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \qquad (5.40)
\end{aligned}$$

For $d = 2$, we proceed as in Step 8. For notational convenience, we only treat the fourth RHS term. We use Hölder's inequality on dyadic annuli A_n with (s', s) for $s = \frac{2}{q'}$ (note that s and s' are switched wrt $d > 2$):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e \omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
\le\ & \sum_{n=0}^\infty \|w_1^{\frac{2}{s'q'}}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{sq'}(A_n)}\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{s'q'}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{s'q'}(A_n)}\\
\le\ & \Big(\sum_{n=0}^\infty \|w_1^{\frac{2}{s'q'}}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{sq'}(A_n)}\Big)\sup_n\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{s'q'}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{s'q'}(A_n)}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, as in (3.55),

$$\|w_1^{\frac{2}{s'q'}}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{sq'}(A_n)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{s'q'}}\min\{\varepsilon 2^n,(\varepsilon 2^n)^{-1}\}^\alpha\|w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{s'q'}+\alpha}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{sq'}(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

so that

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty \|w_1^{\frac{2}{s'q'}}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{sq'}(A_n)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{s'q'}}\|w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{s'q'}+\alpha}\nabla^2\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^{sq'}(\mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

On the other hand, by the critical Sobolev estimate (3.50),

$$\sup_n\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{s'q'}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{s'q'}(A_n)} \lesssim |\log\varepsilon|^{\frac12-\frac{1}{s'q'}}\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{s'q'}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{\frac{2s'q'}{2+s'q'}}(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

which, by Hölder's inequality (cf. (3.57)), turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_n\|w_1^{-\frac{2}{s'q'}}w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\|_{L^{s'q'}(A_n)}\\
&\qquad\lesssim |\log\varepsilon|^{\frac12-\frac{1}{s'q'}}\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}w_1^{-2}(z_e)w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha s'q'}(z_e)(1+|\nabla\phi^e(z_e)|^{s'q'})\Big)^{\frac{1}{s'q'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}w_1^{-2}(z_e)w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha s'q'}(z_e)\Big)^{\frac{1}{s'q'}} \lesssim_\alpha |\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{s'q'}},$$

we conclude by Lemma 3.2 and the our choice $sq'=2$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^4\right]^{\frac12} &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{s'q'}}|\log\varepsilon|\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{s'q'}+\alpha}\nabla^2\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{sq'}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{4-\frac{4}{q'}}|\log\varepsilon|\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2\\ &= \varepsilon^{2-\frac4p}|\log\varepsilon|\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.41}$$

The combination of (5.40) for $d>2$ and (5.41) for $d=2$ yields the following control of the third RHS term of (5.37):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\mathbf{e}_k\nabla_k\Delta_e\phi_j\nabla_k\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\right]^{\frac12}\\ \lesssim \varepsilon^{2-\frac{2d}{p}}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^2\cap L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.42}$$

The sixth RHS term of (5.37) is similar to the fourth RHS term (with $\Delta_e\phi$ replaced by $\Delta_e\sigma$), and the same string of arguments yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e\sigma_j\nabla\nabla_j\bar u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\right]^{\frac12}\lesssim\varepsilon^{2-\frac{2d}{p}}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^2\cap L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\tag{5.43}$$

We obtain by combining (5.38)–(5.43)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\nabla\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4+\|w_\varepsilon^{-\alpha}\sum_e\omega_e\Delta_e(\boldsymbol{a}\nabla w_{\bar u,\varepsilon})\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^4\right]\\ \lesssim\varepsilon^{2-\frac{2d}{p}}\mu_d(\varepsilon)\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^2\cap L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling (5.34) (for $w_{\bar u,\varepsilon}$ and $w_{\bar v,\varepsilon}$) and that $\frac1p+\frac1q=\frac12$, we have thus proved the following estimate of the RHS of (5.33):

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T_1^\varepsilon(\omega)^2+T_2^\varepsilon(\omega)^2\right]\lesssim\varepsilon^{6-d}\mu_d(\varepsilon)^2\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{B}}\omega_e^2\Big)\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar v\|_{L^2\cap L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2\|w_1^{1+\alpha}D^2\bar u\|_{L^2\cap L^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2,$$

so that (5.32) follows by the arbitrariness of $(\omega_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$.

Appendix A. Large-scale maximal regularity

In this appendix, we state and prove a large-scale maximal regularity result for the operator $-D\cdot\boldsymbol{a}D$ under a smallness condition on the extended corrector, which is of independent interest. For simplicity, we display the proof in the continuum setting. The adaptation to the discrete setting is straightforward and left to the reader.

Let $\boldsymbol{a}$ be a fixed λ-uniformly elliptic coefficient field. For every coordinate direction $i = 1, \cdots, d$ let the scalar field ϕ_i, the skew-symmetric field σ_i, and the λ-elliptic fixed tensor $\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}$ be related by

$$\boldsymbol{a}(D\phi_i + \mathbf{e}_i) = \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom}\mathbf{e}_i + D \cdot \sigma_i$$

For a given threshold $\delta > 0$ suppose that there exists $r_* = r_*(x) \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{R}\Big(\fint_{B_R(x)} |(\phi, \sigma) - \fint_{B_R(x)} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \delta \quad \text{for all } R \geq r_*(x) \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{A.1}$$

where (ϕ, σ) stands for any of the components ϕ_i, σ_{ijk}.

Proposition 4. *There exists a threshold $\delta = \delta(d, \lambda) > 0$ and a field $0 < \underline{r_*} \leq r_*$ such that for any suitably decaying scalar field u and vector field g related by*

$$-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a} Du = D \cdot g$$

and any exponent $1 < p < \infty$ we have

$$\int \Big(\fint_{B_{\underline{r_*}}(x)} |Du|^2 \Big)^p dx \lesssim \int |g|^{2p}, \tag{A.2}$$

where $\lesssim$ means $\leq C$ for a constant only depending on d, λ and p. □

This proposition shows that the variable-coefficient operator inherits the maximal-regularity property of the associated homogenized operator $(-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D)$ at scales larger than the minimal radius. For a similar result with a different statement (where the effect of the minimal radius is put on the RHS at the price of a higher exponent on g), see [2].

Proof. It turns out that we may choose $\underline{r_*}$ to be the largest function with Lipschitz constant $L < 1$ below r_*, that it

$$\underline{r_*}(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} (r_*(y) + L|x - y|). \tag{A.3}$$

This implies that (A.1) survives with r_* replaced by $\underline{r_*}$ at the expense of a worse constant δ:

$$\frac{1}{R}\Big(\fint_{B_R(x)} |(\phi, \sigma) - \fint_{B_R(x)} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (\frac{1}{L} + 1)^{\frac{d}{2}+1}\delta \quad \text{for all } R \geq \underline{r_*}(x) \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

Indeed, for a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a radius $R < \infty$ with $\underline{r_*}(x) < R$, by definition (A.3), there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|x - y| \leq \frac{R}{L}$ and $r_*(y) \leq R$. The former implies $B_R(x) \subset B_{\bar{R}}(y)$ where $\bar{R} := (\frac{1}{L} + 1)R$ so that

$$\frac{1}{R}\Big(\fint_{B_R(x)} |(\phi, \sigma) - \fint_{B_R(x)} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (\frac{\bar{R}}{R})^{\frac{d}{2}+1} \frac{1}{\bar{R}}\Big(\fint_{B_{\bar{R}}(y)} |(\phi, \sigma) - \fint_{B_{\bar{R}}(y)} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The latter implies

$$\frac{1}{\bar{R}}\Big(\fint_{B_{\bar{R}}(y)} |(\phi, \sigma) - \fint_{B_{\bar{R}}(y)} (\phi, \sigma)|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \delta.$$

Hence wlog we may assume that r_* is Lipschitz continuous for some constant $L \sim 1$.

Following the standard approach to Calderón-Zygmund in the constant-coefficient case that passes via a BMO-estimate (see for instance [11, Section 7.1.1]), the main ingredient is excess decay for solutions of the homogeneous equation. In the context of our variable coefficient, we have to use an intrinsic notion of excess relying on the harmonic coordinates

$\{\phi_i\}_{i=1,\cdots,d}$ as introduced in [16, Lemma 2]: Provided $\delta \ll 1$ in (A.1) is small enough we have the following: Consider a point x and two radii $R \geq r \geq r_*(x)$ and an a-harmonic function v in $B_R(x)$:

$$-D\cdot \boldsymbol{a}Dv = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R(x).$$

Then we have

$$\inf_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}} \Big(\fint_{B_r(x)} |Dv-\xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i+D\phi_i)|^2 \Big)^{\frac12} \lesssim (\frac{r}{R})^{\frac12} \inf_{\xi} \Big(\fint_{B_R(x)} |Dv-\xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i+D\phi_i)|^2 \Big)^{\frac12}, \quad \text{(A.4)}$$

where we use Einstein's summation convention in $i = 1,\cdots,d$. We remark that the exponent $\frac12$ in (A.4) has nothing special and could be replaced by any exponent $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Following the argument from the standard theory in case of constant coefficients, see for instance [11, Theorem 5.14], we now show that (A.4) implies a Schauder-type estimate for any exponent $0 \leq \alpha < \frac12$ (we will use it for $\alpha = 0$, making the connection with BMO). More precisely, we claim that

$$\sup_{r\geq r_*(x)} \frac{1}{r^\alpha} \inf_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}} \Big(\fint_{B_r(x)} |Du-\xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i+D\phi_i)|^2 \Big)^{\frac12} \lesssim \sup_{R\geq r_*(x)} \frac{1}{R^\alpha} \inf_{\xi} \Big(\fint_{B_R(x)} |g-\xi|^2 \Big)^{\frac12}. \quad \text{(A.5)}$$

In deriving (A.5) from (A.4), we may assume $x = 0$. For given radii $R \geq r \geq r_*$ we denote by w the solution of

$$-D\cdot \boldsymbol{a}Dw = D\cdot g \quad \text{in } B_R, \quad w = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_R.$$

On the one hand, since $D\cdot g = D\cdot(g-\xi)$ for any $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d$, we have by the energy estimate

$$\Big(\fint_{B_R} |Dw|^2 \Big)^{\frac12} \lesssim \inf_{\xi} \Big(\fint_{B_R} |g-\xi|^2 \Big)^{\frac12}. \quad \text{(A.6)}$$

On the other hand, $v := u - w$ is a-harmonic on B_R so that by (A.4)

$$\|v\|_r \lesssim (\frac{r}{R})^{\frac12} \|v\|_R, \quad \text{(A.7)}$$

where we use the abbreviation $\|v\|_r := \inf_\xi \Big(\fint_{B_r} |Dv-\xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i+D\phi_i)|^2 \Big)^{\frac12}$. Since the latter is a semi-norm, we have for any radius r

$$|\|u\|_r - \|v\|_r| \leq \|w\|_r \leq \Big(\fint_{B_r} |Dw|^2 \Big)^{\frac12} \leq (\frac{R}{r})^{\frac{d}{2}} \Big(\fint_{B_R} |Dw|^2 \Big)^{\frac12},$$

into which we insert (A.6)

$$|\|u\|_r - \|v\|_r| \leq \|w\|_r \lesssim (\frac{R}{r})^{\frac{d}{2}} \inf_{\xi} \Big(\fint_{B_R} |g-\xi|^2 \Big)^{\frac12}.$$

We now use the latter twice (the second time with r replaced by R) to pass from v to u in (A.7):

$$\|u\|_r \lesssim (\frac{r}{R})^{\frac12} \|u\|_R + \Big((\frac{R}{r})^{-\frac12} + (\frac{R}{r})^{\frac{d}{2}} \Big) \inf_{\xi} \Big(\fint_{B_R} |g-\xi|^2 \Big)^{\frac12}.$$

Introducing the notation $A := \sup_{r\geq r_*} \frac{1}{r^\alpha} \|u\|_r$ and $B := \sup_{R\geq r_*} \frac{1}{R^\alpha} \inf_\xi \Big(\fint_{B_R} |g-\xi|^2 \Big)^{\frac12}$ we rewrite the latter in the compact form

$$\frac{1}{r^\alpha}\|u\|_r \lesssim (\frac{r}{R})^{\frac12-\alpha} A + (\frac{R}{r})^{\frac{d}{2}+\alpha} B,$$

which we use for $R = Mr$, a fixed large multiple of r, and then taking the supremum over $r \geq r_*$:

$$A \lesssim M^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} A + M^{\frac{d}{2}+\alpha} B.$$

We see that since $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, we may absorb the first RHS term for $M \gg 1$ yielding (A.5) in form of $A \lesssim B$.

In the standard approach to Calderón-Zygmund for constant coefficients, see for instance [11, Proposition 6.31], the main part consists now in controlling the energy density ρ_{stan} by the excess density e_{stan} (the "sharp function" of Du, see for instance [11, Section 6.3.4]) where

$$\rho_{stan} := |Du|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad e_{stan}(x) := \sup_r \inf_\xi \fint_{B_r(x)} |Du - \xi|^2 \tag{A.8}$$

(it is more convenient to work with the squared quantities), which amounts to a result by Fefferman & Stein, see for instance [11, Theorem 6.30]. More precisely, the next simple step in the standard approach consists in deriving the weak-strong estimate

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} |B \cap \{\rho_{stan} \leq 1\}| \sim |B| \\ M \gg 1, \ \int_B e_{stan} \lesssim |B| \end{array}\right\} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad |B \cap \{\rho_{stan} \geq M\}| \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \int_B e_{stan} \tag{A.9}$$

for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. In the standard theory, this is clearly based on the fact the ξ in the definition of the excess is constant; whereas in our case it is replaced by $\xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)$ and thus is only approximately constant on scales $\gtrsim r_*$. In fact, we shall appeal to another ingredient of [16, Lemma 2 (14)], namely

$$\fint_{B_R(x)} |\xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2 \sim |\xi|^2 \quad \text{provided } R \gtrsim r_*(x). \tag{A.10}$$

In what follows, it will be convenient to have a partition $\mathcal{Q}$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ by dyadic cubes Q such that

$$r_* \sim \operatorname{diam}(Q) \quad \text{on } Q. \tag{A.11}$$

Such a partition can be constructed like a Calderón-Zygmund decomposition: $\mathcal{Q}$ consists of those dyadic cubes Q which are such that Q and all its ancestors Q' satisfy

$$\fint_Q r_* \geq \operatorname{diam}(Q) \quad \text{and} \quad \fint_{Q'} r_* < \operatorname{diam}(Q').$$

The second inequality implies

$$\fint_Q r_* \leq 2^{d+1} \operatorname{diam}(Q).$$

Since we may wlog assume that r_* is bounded away from zero, $\mathcal{Q}$ defines indeed a (countable) partition of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Since r_* is Lipschitz continuous with constant $L < 1$, the last inequalities imply (A.11). We now may pass from balls to cubes, more precisely, from (A.10) to

$$\fint_Q |\xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2 \sim |\xi|^2 \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{Q}. \tag{A.12}$$

Indeed, select an $x \in Q$; by (A.11) we have $B_r(x) \subset Q \subset B_R(x)$ for two radii $r, R \sim r_*(x)$, so that (A.10) translates into (A.12).

The price to pay for the lower scale r_* is a softening of the standard version ρ_{stan} of the energy density as follows

$$\rho := \fint_Q |Du|^2 \quad \text{on } Q \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{Q}. \tag{A.13}$$

Equipped with these modifications, we recover (A.10) for our objects: We will argue that for any dyadic D

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} |D \cap \{\rho \le 1\}| \sim |D| \\ M \gg 1, \;\; e(D) \lesssim |D| \end{array}\right\} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad |D \cap \{\rho \ge M\}| \lesssim \frac{1}{M} e(D), \tag{A.14}$$

where we have set for abbreviation

$$e(D) := \inf_{\xi} \int_D |Du - \xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2. \tag{A.15}$$

Indeed, we may assume that D contains a $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, since otherwise ρ would be constant, cf (A.13), and thus (A.14) trivial in view of $M > 1$. Consider now an arbitrary cube $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ contained in D. On the one hand, we have by the upper bound in (A.12) and the definition (A.13) of ρ:

$$\rho = \fint_Q |Du|^2 \lesssim \fint_Q |Du - \xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2 + |\xi|^2 \quad \text{on } Q. \tag{A.16}$$

On the other hand, we have by the lower bound in (A.12)

$$|\xi|^2 \lesssim \fint_Q |Du - \xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2 + \rho \quad \text{on } Q.$$

Summing the latter over all $Q \subset D$ with $\rho_{|Q} \le 1$ we obtain

$$|D \cap \{\rho \le 1\}||\xi|^2 \lesssim \int_D |Du - \xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2 + |D|.$$

Choosing ξ to be the minimizer in (A.15), this turns into $|D \cap \{\rho \le 1\}||\xi|^2 \lesssim e(D) + |D|$, so that by the assumptions in (A.14) we have $|\xi|^2 \lesssim 1$. The combination of this with (A.16) yields because of $M \gg 1$

$$\rho \ge M \text{ on } Q \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \fint_Q |Du - \xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2 \gtrsim M,$$

which we rewrite as (recall that ρ is constant on Q)

$$|Q \cap \{\rho \ge M\}| \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \int_Q |Du - \xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2.$$

Summing over all $Q \subset D$ with $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ yields the RHS of (A.14).

The next step in the standard theory starts from (A.9) and establishes control of the global measure of sub-level sets of ρ_{stan} by the one of sub-level sets of e_{stan}. More precisely, it consists in passing from (A.9) to

$$|\{\rho_{stan} \ge M\}| \lesssim |\{e_{stan} \ge \theta\}| + \frac{\theta}{M} |\{\rho_{stan} \ge 1\}| \quad \text{for } \theta \ll 1 \ll M, \tag{A.17}$$

see for instance [11, Proposition 6.31]. This holds verbatim also in our case

$$|\{\rho \ge M\}| \lesssim |\{e \ge \theta\}| + \frac{\theta}{M} |\{\rho \ge 1\}| \quad \text{for } \theta \ll 1 \ll M, \tag{A.18}$$

where we even may relax the definition of the standard version e_{stan} of the excess density, cf (A.8), which could also be defined with help of the family of dyadic cubes D as $e_{stan}(x) := \sup_{D\ni x}\inf_\xi\Big(\fint_D|Du-\xi_i|^2\Big)$, by restricting the supremum over dyadic cubes to those that are ancestors of cubes in the decomposition $\mathcal{Q}$:

$$e(x) := \sup_{D\ni x}\Big\{\frac{e(D)}{|D|}\Big|Q\subset D \text{ for some } Q\in\mathcal{Q}\Big\}, \tag{A.19}$$

where $e(D)$ is defined in (A.15). The argument in passing from (A.14) to (A.18) is identical to the argument for passing from (A.9) to (A.17). By successive divisions we construct a Calderón-Zygmund partition $\mathcal{D}$ based on the characteristic function of $\{\rho\geq 1\}$. In other words, $\mathcal{D}$ consists of those dyadic cubes D such that that it and all its ancestors $D'\supset D$ satisfy

$$|D\cap\{\rho\geq 1\}|>\frac{1}{2^{d+1}}|D| \quad\text{and}\quad |D'\cap\{\rho\geq 1\}|\leq\frac{1}{2^{d+1}}|D'|. \tag{A.20}$$

This yields an essentially disjoint decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ into $\{D\}_{D\in\mathcal{D}}$ and a set where $\rho<1$. Hence for (A.18) it is enough to show for every cube $D\in\mathcal{D}$:

$$|D\cap\{\rho\geq M\}|\lesssim|D\cap\{e\geq\theta\}|+\frac{\theta}{M}|D\cap\{\rho\geq 1\}| \quad\text{for } \theta\ll 1\ll M. \tag{A.21}$$

Note that the first and second properties in (A.20) imply in particular

$$\frac{1}{2^{d+1}}|D|\leq|D\cap\{\rho\geq 1\}|\leq\frac{1}{2}|D|, \tag{A.22}$$

one of the LHS conditions in (A.14). In addition, this yields that ρ is not constant on D. By the definition (A.14) of ρ this implies that there is a $Q\in\mathcal{Q}$ such that $Q\subset D$ (strictly, in fact). Hence in view of the definition (A.19)

$$|D|e\geq e(D) \quad\text{on } Q. \tag{A.23}$$

To recover the other LHS condition in (A.14), we first consider the case $e(D)<\theta|D|\lesssim|D|$ in which case the RHS of (A.14) assumes the form $|D\cap\{\rho\geq M\}|\lesssim\frac{\theta}{M}|D|$, which together with (A.22) yields (A.21) in this case. It remains to consider the case $e(D)\geq\theta|D|$, which by (A.23) implies $D\cap\{e\geq\theta\}=D$ so that (A.21) is automatically met.

The previous to last step in the standard argument is to convert (A.17) into the L^p-estimate $\int\rho_{stan}^p\lesssim\int e_{stan}^p$ for any $1<p<\infty$, see for instance [11, Theorem 6.30]. By the same argument we may pass from (A.18) to

$$\int\rho^p\lesssim\int e^p. \tag{A.24}$$

Indeed, by a scaling argument in form of $u=t\hat{u}$ we may upgrade (A.18) to

$$|\{\rho\geq Mt\}|\lesssim|\{e\geq\theta t\}|+\frac{\theta}{M}|\{\rho\geq t\}| \quad\text{for } \theta\ll 1\ll M \text{ and all } t>0.$$

Integrating against t^{p-1} we obtain

$$\frac{1}{M^p}\int\rho^p\lesssim\frac{1}{\theta^p}\int e^p+\frac{\theta}{M}\int\rho^p \quad\text{for } \theta\ll 1\ll M.$$

Fixing an $M\sim 1$ sufficiently large for which this inequality holds; then we choose $\theta\sim 1$ sufficiently small so that the last term may be absorbed, yielding (A.24).

We now return from cubes to balls and start with the excess. Based on the Lipschitz continuity of r_* we claim that for any point x

$$e(x) \lesssim \sup_{R\geq r_*(x)} \inf_{\xi} \fint_{B_R(x)} |Du - \xi_i(\mathbf{e}_i + D\phi_i)|^2. \tag{A.25}$$

The definition (A.19) prompts us to consider any dyadic cube D with $x \in D$ and such that there exists a $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $Q \subset D$ for which we have to show

$$\frac{e(D)}{|D|} \lesssim \frac{e(B_R(x))}{|B_R|} \quad \text{for some } R \geq r_*(x).$$

Since $Q \subset D$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have $\inf_D r_* \lesssim \operatorname{diam}(Q) \lesssim \operatorname{diam}(D)$ in view of (A.11). By the Lipschitz continuity of r_*, $x \in D$ then yields $r_*(x) \lesssim \operatorname{diam}(D)$, which implies $D \subset B_R(x)$ for some $r_*(x) \leq R \sim \operatorname{diam}(D)$. This gives both $e(D) \leq e(B_R(x))$ and $|D| \gtrsim |B_R|$, so that the claim (A.25) follows.

We continue to revert back to balls from cubes and look at the energy density. Using the Lipschitz continuity of r_* with small constant we show that

$$\int (\fint_{B_{r_*}(x)} |Du|^2)^p dx \lesssim \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} |Q| (\fint_Q |Du|^2)^p \overset{(A.13)}{=} \int \rho^p. \tag{A.26}$$

Starting point is the inequality

$$\fint_{B_{r_*}(x)} |Du|^2 \leq \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} k(x,Q) \fint_Q |Du|^2,$$

where the "kernel" k is defined through

$$k(x,Q) := \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \frac{|Q|}{|B_{r_*(x)}|} & \text{provided} \quad Q \cap B_{r_*(x)}(x) \neq \varnothing \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{array} \right\}. \tag{A.27}$$

Since by Jensen's inequality

$$\Big(\fint_{B_{r_*}(x)} |Du|^2\Big)^p \leq \Big(\sum_{Q'\in\mathcal{Q}} k(x,Q')\Big)^{p-1} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} k(x,Q) \Big(\fint_Q \rho\Big)^p,$$

(A.26) follows once we establish

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} k(x,Q) \lesssim 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int k(x,Q)dx \lesssim |Q|. \tag{A.28}$$

In view of (A.27) the first of these estimates can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}: Q\cap B_{r_*(x)}(x)\neq\varnothing} |Q| \lesssim |B_{r_*(x)}|. \tag{A.29}$$

Since by (A.11) and the Lipschitz continuity of r_* we have for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ that $\operatorname{diam}(Q) \lesssim \inf_Q r_* \leq r_*(x) + L\operatorname{dist}(x,Q) \leq (1+L) r_*(x)$ in case of $Q \cap B_{r_*(x)}(x) \neq \varnothing$ and thus $Q \subset B_R(x)$ for $R \sim r_*(x)$, so that (A.29) follows. In view of (A.27) the second estimate in (A.28) can be rewritten as

$$\Big|\{\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d : Q \cap B_{r_*(x)}(x) \neq \varnothing \,\}\Big| \lesssim |B_{r_*(x)}|. \tag{A.30}$$

Arguing as above, we have $\operatorname{diam}(Q) \gtrsim \sup_Q r_* \geq r_*(x) - L\operatorname{dist}(x,Q) \geq (1-L) r_*(x)$ so that $\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : Q \cap B_{r_*(x)}(x) \neq \emptyset \} \subset B_R(x)$ for some $R \lesssim \operatorname{diam}(Q)$. Since according to the above $\operatorname{diam}(Q) \lesssim r_*(x)$, (A.30) follows.

We now may conclude: We use (A.5) with $\alpha = 0$ and combine it with (A.25)

$$e(x) \lesssim \sup_{R>0} \fint_{B_R(x)} |g|^2.$$

We now use (A.24) with the Maximal Function estimate (see for instance [11, Proposition 6.12]) to obtain

$$\int \rho^p \lesssim \int |g|^{2p}.$$

which in combination with (A.26) yields the claim. □

Appendix B. Approximation argument

In this appendix we quickly explain how our results relate to the scaling limit results for both the solution u_ε of the PDE with random coefficients in [24], and (for $d > 2$) the rescaled corrector $\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})$ [33, 32].

(a) We start with the solution u_ε of the PDE with random coefficients. Given $f, g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (with mean-value zero for $d = 2$), we set $f_\varepsilon := P_\varepsilon f$, $g_\varepsilon := P_\varepsilon g$, and we let u_ε, v_ε satisfy (2.10). Denoting by $\bar u_\varepsilon, \bar v_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ the solutions of

$$-\nabla_\varepsilon^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} \nabla_\varepsilon \bar u_\varepsilon = f_\varepsilon, \qquad -\nabla_\varepsilon^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} \nabla_\varepsilon \bar v_\varepsilon = g_\varepsilon,$$

we may by definition rewrite

$$\varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int (u_\varepsilon(x) - \mathbb{E}\,[u_\varepsilon(x)]) g(x) dx = \varepsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int (v_\varepsilon(x) - \mathbb{E}\,[v_\varepsilon(x)]) f(x) dx = I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u_\varepsilon, \bar v_\varepsilon).$$

By elliptic regularity for the (discrete) constant-coefficient operator, for all $0 < \alpha \ll 1$, $0 < q - 2 \ll 1$ small enough, and $p \gg 1$ large enough

$$\|(\nabla_\varepsilon \bar u_\varepsilon, \nabla_\varepsilon \bar v_\varepsilon)\|_{W^{2,4} \cap W^{2,2q}_{\frac12+\alpha}(\mathbb{Z}^d_\varepsilon)} + \|(\nabla_\varepsilon^2 \bar u_\varepsilon, \nabla_\varepsilon^2 \bar v_\varepsilon)\|_{L^2_{1+\alpha} \cap L^p_{1+\alpha}(\mathbb{Z}^d_\varepsilon)} < \infty,$$

uniformly in ε. Since the convergence of the Helmholtz projections

$$\nabla_\varepsilon \bar u_\varepsilon \to D(-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D)^{-1} f =: D\bar u, \qquad \nabla_\varepsilon \bar v_\varepsilon \to D(-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D)^{-1} g =: D\bar v$$

holds in these norms, we directly deduce

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u_\varepsilon, \bar v_\varepsilon) + I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar u \otimes D\bar v)\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{P})} = 0,$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} d_W\Big(I_2^\varepsilon(\bar u_\varepsilon, \bar v_\varepsilon), \Gamma(D\bar u \otimes D\bar v)\Big) = 0.$$

(b) We now turn to the corrector $\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})$ for $d > 2$. Given $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$, we set $G_\varepsilon := P_\varepsilon G$, and we consider the random variable

$$\hat I_3^\varepsilon(G) := \varepsilon^{1-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}) G(x) dx = \varepsilon^{1-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}) G_\varepsilon(x) dx.$$

Denoting by $\bar V_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ the solution of

$$-\nabla_\varepsilon^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} \nabla_\varepsilon \bar V_{\varepsilon,i} = G_{\varepsilon,i},$$

we are tempted to write formally $\hat{I}_3^\varepsilon(G) = I_3^\varepsilon(\nabla_\varepsilon \bar{V}_\varepsilon)$. However, this does not make sense a priori since $\bar{V}_\varepsilon$ does not necessarily belong to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$ (as opposed to the situation in case (a)). Some approximation argument is therefore needed. For all $\eta > 0$, set $\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta} := \bar{V}_\varepsilon \chi_\eta$ and $\chi_\eta(x) := \chi(\eta x)$, where χ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi|_{B_1} \equiv 1$ and $\chi|_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_2} \equiv 0$, and also define $G_{\eta,\varepsilon} := -\nabla_\varepsilon^* \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} \nabla_\varepsilon \bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$. By the variance estimate (and similar arguments as in the rest of this paper), one may prove that

$$\mathrm{var}\Big[\hat{I}_3^\varepsilon(G) - I_3^\varepsilon(\nabla_\varepsilon \bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta})\Big] = \mathrm{var}\Big[\hat{I}_3^\varepsilon(G) - \hat{I}_3^\varepsilon(G_{\varepsilon,\eta})\Big] \lesssim_G \eta^{d-2} |\log(\varepsilon\eta)|.$$

Since $\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ is compactly supported, we may apply (2.15) to $\mathcal{F} = D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$. From a close look at the dependence of the norms of $D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ in η, we deduce

$$d_W(I_1^\varepsilon(D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta}), \Gamma(D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta})) \lesssim \varepsilon^\gamma \eta^{-\beta},$$

for some $\beta, \gamma > 0$. Finally, by definition of Γ,

$$\mathrm{var}\big[\Gamma(D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta}) - \Gamma(D\bar{V})\big] \lesssim \|D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta} - D\bar{V}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2,$$

where $\bar{V} := (-D \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{\rm hom} D)^{-1} G$. Hence, for all $\alpha > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{var}\big[\Gamma(D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta}) - \Gamma(D\bar{V})\big] &\lesssim \|D\bar{V}_{\varepsilon,\eta} - D\bar{V}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \\
&\lesssim \|D((1-\chi_\eta)\bar{V}_\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + \|D\bar{V}_\varepsilon - D\bar{V}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \\
&\lesssim \eta^2 \|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + \eta^\alpha \|(1+|\cdot|)^\alpha D\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + \|D\bar{V}_\varepsilon - D\bar{V}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{V}$ is compactly supported, $\bar{V}_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $H^1_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$ for $\alpha > 0$ small enough by elliptic regularity. Combined with the convergence of the Helmholtz projection $D\bar{V}_\varepsilon \to D\bar{V}$ n $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, one concludes after optimizing η in function of ε that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} d_W\Big(\hat{I}_3^\varepsilon(G), \Gamma(D\bar{V})\Big) = 0.$$

Note however that the path-wise character is lost in this argument.

Acknowledgements

The work of MD is supported by F.R.S.-FNRS (Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research) through a Research Fellowship. MD and AG acknowledge financial support from the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2014-2019 Grant Agreement QUANTHOM 335410). The authors acknowledge the hospitality of IHÉS, where this work was initiated, and the support of the Schlumberger chair.

References

[1] S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, and J.-C. Mourrat. The additive structure of elliptic homogenization. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2016.

[2] S. N. Armstrong and J.-P. Daniel. Calderón-Zygmund estimates for stochastic homogenization. *J. Functional Anal.*, 2015.

[3] S. N. Armstrong and J.-C. Mourrat. Lipschitz Regularity for Elliptic Equations with Random Coefficients. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, July 2015.

[4] S. N. Armstrong and C. K. Smart. Quantitative stochastic homogenization of convex integral functionals. *Ann. Sci. E.N.S.*

[5] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. *Interpolation spaces. An introduction.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223.

[6] M. Biskup, M. Salvi, and T. Wolff. A Central Limit Theorem for the Effective Conductance: Linear Boundary Data and Small Ellipticity Contrasts. *Commun. Math. Physics*, 328(2):701–731, 2014.
[7] S. Chatterjee. A new method of normal approximation. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(4):1584–1610, 2008.
[8] J. G. Conlon and T. Spencer. A strong central limit theorem for a class of random surfaces. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 325(1):1–15, 2014.
[9] J.G. Conlon and A. Naddaf. On homogenization of elliptic equations with random coefficients. *Elec. Journal of Probability*, 5:1–58, 2000. Paper no. 9.
[10] M. Duerinckx and A. Gloria. Quantitative stochastic homogenization via weighted functional inequalities. in preparation.
[11] M. Giaquinta and L. Martinazzi. *An introduction to the regularity theory for elliptic systems, harmonic maps and minimal graphs*, volume 11 of *Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie) [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)]*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, second edition, 2012.
[12] A. Gloria. Fluctuation of solutions to linear elliptic equations with noisy diffusion coefficients. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 38(2):304–338, 2013.
[13] A. Gloria and Z. Habibi. Reduction in the Resonance Error in Numerical Homogenization II: Correctors and Extrapolation. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 16(1):217–296, 2016.
[14] A. Gloria and D. Marahrens. Annealed estimates on the Green functions and uncertainty quantification. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*. arXiv:1409.0569.
[15] A. Gloria and J.-C. Mourrat. Spectral measure and approximation of homogenized coefficients. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 154(1), 287–326, 2012.
[16] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. A regularity theory for random elliptic operators and homogenization. arXiv:1409.2678.
[17] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. An optimal quantitative two-scale expansion in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 48(2):325–346, 2014.
[18] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. Quantification of ergodicity in stochastic homogenization: optimal bounds via spectral gap on Glauber dynamics. *Invent. Math.*, 199(2):455–515, 2015.
[19] A. Gloria and J. Nolen. A quantitative central limit theorem for the effective conductance on the discrete torus. *Commun. Pure and Appl. Math.* arXiv:1410.5734.
[20] A. Gloria and F. Otto. Quantitative results on the corrector equation in stochastic homogenization. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*. arXiv:1409.0801.
[21] A. Gloria and F. Otto. An optimal variance estimate in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(3):779–856, 2011.
[22] A. Gloria and F. Otto. An optimal error estimate in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(1):1–28, 2012.
[23] A. Gloria and F. Otto. The corrector in stochastic homogenization: nearly-optimal rates with optimal stochastic integrability. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2015.
[24] Y. Gu and J.-C. Mourrat. Scaling limit of fluctuations in stochastic homogenization. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2015.
[25] B Helffer and J. Sjöstrand. On the correlation for Kac-like models in the convex case. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 74(1-2):349–409, 1994.
[26] R. Hill. Elastic properties of reinforced solids: Some theoretical principles. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 11:357–372, 1963.
[27] R. Hill. On constitutive macro-variables for heterogeneous solids at finite strain. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 326:131–146, 1972.
[28] L. B. Koralov and Y. G. Sinai. *Theory of probability and random processes*. Universitext. Springer, Berlin, second edition, 2007.
[29] S.M. Kozlov. The averaging of random operators. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 109(151)(2):188–202, 327, 1979.
[30] R. Künnemann. The diffusion limit for reversible jump processes on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with ergodic random bond conductivities. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 90:27–68, 1983.
[31] D. Marahrens and F. Otto. Annealed estimates on the Green function. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, in press.
[32] J.-C. Mourrat and J. Nolen. Scaling limit of the corrector in stochastic homogenization. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2015.

[33] J.-C. Mourrat and F. Otto. Correlation structure of the corrector in stochastic homogenization. *Ann. Probab.* arXiv:1402.1924.
[34] F. Murat and L. Tartar. H-convergence. In *Topics in the mathematical modelling of composite materials*, volume 31 of *Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, pages 21–43. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1997.
[35] A. Naddaf and T. Spencer. Estimates on the variance of some homogenization problems. Preprint, 1998.
[36] J. Nolen. Normal approximation for a random elliptic equation. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, 159(3):661–700, 2014.
[37] G.C. Papanicolaou and S.R.S. Varadhan. Boundary value problems with rapidly oscillating random coefficients. In *Random fields, Vol. I, II (Esztergom, 1979)*, volume 27 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, pages 835–873. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.
[38] R. Rossignol. Noise-stability and central limit theorems for effective resistance of random electric networks. *Ann. Probab.* arXiv:1206.3856.
[39] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, volume 43 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.
[40] S. Torquato. *Random heterogeneous materials*, volume 16 of *Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. Microstructure and macroscopic properties.
[41] J. Wehr. A lower bound on the variance of conductance in random resistor network. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 86(5-6):1359–1365, 1997.
[42] J. Wehr and M. Aizenman. Fluctuations of extensive functions of quenched random couplings. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 60(3-4):287–306, 1990.

(Mitia Duerinckx) Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium, and Inria, Lille, France
E-mail address: mduerinc@ulb.ac.be

(Antoine Gloria) Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium, and Inria, Lille, France
E-mail address: agloria@ulb.ac.be

(Felix Otto) Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig, Germany
E-mail address: otto@mis.mpg.de